

for campaign finance reform are a central part of the problem.

Television stations in New York and Philadelphia during the recent New Jersey Democratic primary took in a record \$21 million in advertising. The chart shows the stations in New York and Philadelphia, the four rated stations, the amount of time they actually devoted to hard news. We have these stations in New York and Philadelphia bringing in \$21 million in revenue from political advertising. Yet in actual news coverage of the campaigns per evening—two stations in Philadelphia—one is giving 19 seconds of coverage per evening; another, 1 second; in New York, the two top stations, WNBC and WCBS, 23 seconds and 10 seconds, respectively.

Advertising rates soar. News coverage collapses. Candidates are left with no choice. There being no other means to communicate with people who live in our States, they must buy more advertising time at ever-higher and higher rates. Indeed, in the final 2 weeks of the New Jersey primary, voters in Philadelphia and New York markets were 10 times more likely while watching a news program to see a campaign advertisement than a news story—10 times more likely to see an advertisement than a legitimate news story on an issue in the campaign.

That, my colleagues, is the heart of the problem. However, it is not only a senatorial problem or not only a problem in my own region of the country. During the month before the March 7, Super Tuesday primary, the national networks aired a nightly average of only 36 seconds discussing an issue of importance to the national voters. The situation that Democrats and Republicans face in the New Jersey primary is identical to what AL GORE and George W. Bush face in the national elections—no news coverage, rising rates, higher expenditures. It is, of course, part and parcel of this problem that is driven by the individual rates for specific advertising time.

An example of this would be, in New York City, a 30-second advertisement can now cost as much as \$50,000. In Chicago, the same advertisement could cost \$20,000. Television stations in the Nation's top 75 media markets took in a record of \$114 million in the first 4 months of this year in political advertising.

There is no other nation in the world where the public airwaves are licensed to a private corporation which will then set commercial rates as the cost of discussing public policy issues with the Nation's voters. This wouldn't happen in Britain, Canada, Italy or France. These airwaves belong to the American people. The issues, be they Democrat, Republican, or Independent, be they from some other group or political party, are issues of importance to the American people. Yet the broad-

casting networks are using them as a revenue source while they incredibly claim to be campaigning for campaign finance reform.

There is no mistaking that the power to change the campaign finance system belongs in the Congress. We could lead to a solution. For a variety of political reasons, legislative reasons, and constitutional reasons, that is not going to happen. The question now is whether the television networks will spend the remainder of this electoral season complaining about this political problem of reaching a solution or be part of the answer. I believe they should lead by example.

Only a year ago, Mr. Kennard, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, raised the prospect of, by regulation, lowering the cost of television advertising. Rather than \$50,000 in New York or \$20,000 in Chicago, the FCC could mandate, if the networks are unwilling to do it voluntarily, a lower cost. Since television accounts for 80 or 90 percent of the cost of the Senate or Presidential campaign, lowering the cost of that advertising would dramatically remove pressure on fundraising. The problem could begin to solve itself. The FCC chose not to do so under pressure from Members of Congress.

The question remains, Why do the networks not do so themselves? I understand the networks looking to the Congress for an answer. They should. They are entitled to look to us, and they are entitled to expect an answer. But I also look back to them. Rather than 20 seconds a night for candidates to discuss the future of our Nation, rather than using the national airwaves to discuss every latest crime trend or weather pattern or cultural abnormality, the national airwaves could be used to actually discuss the Nation's future—not 10 seconds a night or 20 seconds a night but 10 minutes a night or 15 minutes a night so candidates believe there is an alternative to communicating with the American people other than buying the public airwaves to do so.

Second, the networks, most obviously, could enhance this national debate and reduce the cost of this fundraising, remove the pressure on fundraising by dramatically reducing these costs. Political advertising is now the third largest source of revenue for the television networks. We have become an industry supporting the networks themselves, only behind retail sellers of merchandise in the Nation, spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this Presidential and congressional campaign. A reduction of those rates to allow challengers to compete with incumbents and lesser-financed candidates to compete with multimillionaires would enhance the American political system and start setting an example of how the Nation can begin to

change the dominance of money in the American political system.

I hope at some point the networks, as good corporate citizens and as Americans, no less as people who claim to be for campaign finance reform, would hear this message and join this movement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until 11 a.m.

Thereupon, at 10:22 a.m., the Senate recessed until 11:01; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2522, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Pending:

SESSIONS amendment No. 3492, to provide an additional condition on assistance for Colombia under Plan Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order that I deliver my statement while seated at my desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3498

(Purpose: Relating to support by the Russian Federation for Serbia)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be in

order at this time. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 3498.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SUPPORT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FOR SERBIA.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) General Dragolub Ojdanic, Minister of Defense of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and an indicted war criminal, visited Moscow from May 7 through May 12, 2000, as a guest of the Government of the Russian Federation, attended the inauguration of President Vladimir Putin, and held talks with Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeyev and Army Chief of Staff Anatoly Kvashnin;

(2) General Ojdanic was military Chief of Staff of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo war and has been indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) for crimes against humanity and violations of the laws and customs of war for alleged atrocities against Albanians in Kosovo;

(3) international warrants have been issued by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for General Ojdanic's arrest and extradition to the Hague;

(4) the Government of the Russian Federation, a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council which established the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, has an obligation to arrest General Ojdanic and extradite him to the Hague;

(5) on May 16, 2000, Russian Minister of Economics Andrei Shapovalyants announced that his government has provided the Serbian regime of Slobodan Milosevic \$102,000,000 of a \$150,000,000 loan it had reactivated and will sell the Government of Serbia \$32,000,000 of oil despite the fact that the international community has imposed economic sanctions against the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of Serbia;

(6) the Government of the Russian Federation is providing the Milosevic regime such assistance while it is seeking debt relief from the international community and loans from the International Monetary Fund, and while it is receiving corn and grain as food aid from the United States;

(7) the hospitality provided to General Ojdanic demonstrates that the Government of the Russian Federation rejects the indictments brought by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia against him and other officials, including Slobodan Milosevic, for alleged atrocities committed during the Kosovo war; and

(8) the relationship between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Governments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Serbia only encourages the regime of Slobodan Milosevic to foment instability in the Balkans and thereby jeopardizes the safety and security of American military and civilian personnel and raises questions about Russia's commitment to its responsibilities

as a member of the North American Treaty Organization-led peacekeeping mission in Kosovo.

(b) ACTIONS.—

(1) Fifteen days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report to Congress detailing all loans, financial assistance, and energy sales the Government of the Russian Federation or entities acting on its behalf has provided since June 1999, and intends to provide to the Government of Serbia or the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any entities under the control of the Governments of Serbia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) If that report determines that the Government of the Russian Federation or other entities acting on its behalf has provided or intends to provide the governments of Serbia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any entity under their control any loans or economic assistance and oil sales, then the following shall apply:

(A) The Secretary of State shall reduce assistance obligated to the Russian Federation by an amount equal in value to the loans, financial assistance, and energy sales the Government of the Russian Federation has provided and intends to provide to the Governments of Serbia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(B)(i) The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to oppose, and vote against, any extension by those institutions of any financial assistance (including any technical assistance or grant) of any kind to the Government of the Russian Federation except for loans and assistance that serve basic human needs.

(ii) In this subparagraph, the term "international financial institution" includes the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment Guaranty Agency, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(C) The United States shall suspend existing programs to the Russia Federation provided by the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and any consideration of any new loans, guarantees, and other forms of assistance by the Export-Import Bank or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to Russia.

(D) The President of the United States should instruct his representatives to negotiations on Russia's international debt to oppose further forgiveness, restructuring, and rescheduling of that debt, including that being considered under the "Comprehensive" Paris Club negotiations.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in the hopes that it will bring about needed realism in our Government's relationship with Russia. President Clinton continues to promote the myth that the Russian Government has been "a supportive and reliable partner in the effort to bring peace and stability to the Balkans."

That myth was shattered again last month by the Kremlin's brazen display of the enormous political, military, and economic support Russia continues to provide the Milosevic regime. Surely no Senator has forgotten the visit to Moscow last month by General

Ojdanic, Milosevic's Minister of Defense, who just happens to be a war criminal indicted by the International Criminal Tribunal of the former Yugoslavia. Instead of arresting and sending this man to The Hague, the Kremlin provided not only meetings with the Russian Minister of Defense but a privileged seat at the Putin inauguration and a week of fine food and camaraderie.

Shortly after Milosevic's Minister of Defense visited Russia, Russian officials announced that it is sending to the Milosevic regime \$102 million of a \$150 million loan. All of this flies in the face of the effort of the international community to isolate and undermine the Milosevic regime.

I confess that I find incredible the audacity of Russian President Putin. Here he is, providing the Milosevic regime with more than \$150 million in economic support while seeking debt relief from the international community and loans from the International Monetary Fund. He is doing this while his country seeks and receives food aid from the United States and while he is asking the United States to reschedule and forgive Russian debt owed to the United States.

The Kremlin should not be encouraged to assume that Western, and particularly the United States, economic assistance and aid are an entitlement. It is, however, sadly evident that Putin has concluded that he can conduct Russian foreign policy with impunity and still count on the West's economic largesse. The fact is, the hospitality and support provided to Serbian war criminals occurred just one month prior to President Clinton's visit to Moscow, emphasizing how little respect Putin has for the policies of the U.S. Government.

What concerns me most about the relationship of the Kremlin and the Milosevic regime is the threat it poses to America's men and women in uniform serving in the Balkans, along with those of our allies. The political, military, and economic support the Kremlin provides Milosevic directly jeopardizes the safety and security of both American and allied forces deployed in the Balkans. While we are trying to force the Milosevic regime to step down and turn power over to Serbia's democratic opposition, Russia is signaling Milosevic that he can survive and even outlast the alliance and that Russia will help him, Milosevic, prevail.

There is no reason the American taxpayer should provide Russia loan forgiveness and economic assistance when the Kremlin continues to support a regime in Serbia whose forces directly threaten U.S. troops who are trying to bring peace to the Balkans.

My amendment, which I have just offered, simply underscores that the U.S. assistance is not an entitlement benefiting the Kremlin. The amendment

proposes that the United States withhold assistance to Russia by an amount equal to the amount which Russia provides Serbia. The amendment also will preclude any debt forgiveness or re-scheduling of OPIC and Eximbank programs along with U.S. support for loans from international financial institutions to Russia. This assistance certainly is not warranted unless and until the Kremlin demonstrates that it has at long last cut its ties to the Milosevic regime.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3499 THROUGH 3513, EN BLOC

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a group of managers' amendments to the desk, en bloc, and ask for their immediate consideration. They have been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes amendments numbered 3499 through 3513, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3499

On page 142, on line 5 strike: "*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available for administration of demobilizing and rehabilitating activities for child soldiers in Colombia" and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of State for transfer to the Department of Labor for the administration of the demobilization and rehabilitation of child soldiers in Colombia, of which amount \$2,500,000 shall be transferred not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and the remaining \$2,500,000 shall be transferred not later than October 30, 2000".

AMENDMENT NO. 3500

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of State to submit a report concerning human rights in Colombia, and for other purposes)

On page 145, line 12, after "(b)" and before "DEFINITIONS", insert the following:

"REPORT.—Beginning 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for the duration of the provision of resources administered under this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing the following:

"(1) A description of the extent to which the Colombian Armed Forces have suspended from duty Colombian Armed Forces personnel who are credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, and the extent to which such personnel have been brought to justice in Colombia's civilian courts, including a description of the charges brought and the disposition of such cases.

"(2) An assessment of efforts made by the Colombian Armed Forces, National Police, and Attorney General to disband paramilitary groups, including the names of Colombian Armed Forces personnel brought to justice for aiding or abetting paramilitary groups and the names of paramilitary leaders and members who were indicted, arrested and prosecuted.

"(3) A description of the extent to which the Colombian Armed Forces cooperate with

civilian authorities in investigating and prosecuting gross violations of human rights allegedly committed by its personnel, including the number of such personnel being investigated for gross violations of human rights who are suspended from duty.

"(4) A description of the extent to which attacks against human rights defenders, government prosecutors and investigators, and officials of the civilian judicial system in Colombia, are being investigated and the alleged perpetrators brought to justice.

"(5) An estimate of the number of Colombian civilians displaced as a result of the "push into southern Colombia," and actions taken to address the social and economic needs of these people.

"(6) A description of actions taken by the United States and the Government of Colombia to promote and support a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Colombia.

"(c)".

AMENDMENT NO. 3501

On page 13, line 16, after "vaccines" insert in lieu thereof: ", notwithstanding any other provision of law".

On page 13, line 8, delete "41,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$35,000,000".

On page 13, line 11, delete "\$65,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$50,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 3502

On page 57, line 19, delete the following: "Panama,".

AMENDMENT NO. 3503

(Purpose: To appropriate funds to assist blind children)

Before the period at the end of the paragraph under the heading "Global Health", insert the following: "": *Provided Further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$1,200,000 should be made available to assist blind children".

AMENDMENT NO. 3504

On page 151, line 10, after "6105" insert "HERBICIDE SAFETY.—".

On page 151, line 12, strike "Surgeon General of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "Director of the National Center for Environmental Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention".

On page 151, line 11, strike "aerial spraying" and insert in lieu thereof "use".

On page 151, line 18, strike "water or leach in soil" and insert in lieu thereof "ground or surface water".

AMENDMENT NO. 3505

On page 38, line 6, strike "\$330,000,000" and insert "\$340,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 3506

On page 63, on line 9 after the words "Sec. 530." strike all through line 15 and insert the following:

"(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subsection (b), the United States may not sell or otherwise make available under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 any Stinger ground-to-air missiles to any country bordering the Persian Gulf.

"(b) ADDITIONAL TRANSFERS AUTHORIZED.—In addition to other defense articles authorized to be transferred by section 581 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1990, the United States may sell or make avail-

able, under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Stinger ground to air missiles to any country bordering the Persian Gulf in order to replace, on a one-for-one basis, Stinger missiles previously furnished to such country if the Stinger missiles to be replaced are nearing the scheduled expiration of their shelf-life."

AMENDMENT NO. 3507

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new general provision.

PROCUREMENT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REFORM

SEC. . (a) Of the funds made available under the heading "International Financial Institutions" in this or any prior Foreign Operations, Export Financing, or Related Programs Act, 10 percent of the United States portion or payment to such International Financial Institution shall be withheld by the Secretary of Treasury, until the Secretary certifies that—

(1) the institution is implementing procedures for conducting semi-annual audits by qualified independent auditors for all new lending;

(2) the institution has taken steps to establish an independent fraud and corruption investigative organization or office;

(3) the institution has implemented a program to assess a recipient country's procurement and financial management capabilities including an analysis of the risks of corruption prior to initiating new lending; and

(4) the institution is taking steps to fund and implement measures to improve transparency and anticorruption programs and procurement and financial management controls in recipient countries.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of Treasury shall report on March 1, 2001 to the Committees on Appropriations on progress made to fulfill the objectives identified in subsection (A).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—The term "International Financial Institutions" means the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

AMENDMENT NO. 3508

On page 21, line 21, after the word "organizations" insert, "": *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for Kosovo, not less than \$1,300,000 shall be made available to support the National Albanian American Council's training program for Kosovar women".

AMENDMENT NO. 3509

On page 21, at the end of Section (c) insert the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than \$750,000 shall be made available for a joint project developed by the University of Pristina, Kosova and the Dartmouth Medical School, U.S.A., to help restore the primary care capabilities at the University of Pristina Medical School and in Kosova".

## AMENDMENT NO. 3510

(Purpose: To require the submittal to the congressional intelligence committees of reports on waivers relating to assistance to countries providing sanctuary to indicted war criminals)

On page 103, beginning on line 13, strike "Committee on Appropriations" and all that follows through "House of Representatives" and insert "Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and International Relations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives".

## AMENDMENT NO. 3511

(Purpose: To make available certain environmental assistance funds for the People's Republic of China)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ USE OF FUNDS FOR THE UNITED STATES-ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, funds appropriated by this or any other Act making appropriations pursuant to part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 that are made available for the United States-Asia Environmental Partnership may be made available for activities for the People's Republic of China.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3512

(Purpose: To make available funds for education and anti-corruption programs)

On page 140, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ EDUCATION AND ANTI-CORRUPTION ASSISTANCE.**

Section 638 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2398) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, funds made available to carry out the provisions of part I of this Act may be furnished for assistance for education programs and for anti-corruption programs, except that this subsection shall not apply to section 490(e) or 620A of this Act or any other comparable provision of law."

## AMENDMENT NO. 3513

(Purpose: To add \$2,500,000 to Title \_\_\_\_\_, Research and Development for the Foundation for Environmental Security and Sustainability to support the need for environmental security assessments for economic planning, and operations support)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

Of the funds to be appropriated under this heading, \$2,500,000 is available for the Foundation for Environmental Security and Sustainability to support environmental threat assessments with interdisciplinary experts and academicians utilizing various technologies to address issues such as infectious disease, and other environmental indicators and warnings as they pertain to the security of an area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 3499 through 3513), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3507

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past two years, the Subcommittee has held hearings which have focused on corruption, fraud and financial management problems at the international financial institutions. The interest was stimulated in part by flagrant abuses which compromised the World Bank's program in Indonesia. The Bank's Country Director ignored internal reports detailing program kickbacks, skimming and fraud because he was unwilling to upset the Suharto family and their cronies whom he believed were responsible for Indonesia's economic boom. A change of government and country directors presented an opportunity to set a new course for management and lending policies.

Because of these problems, I asked GAO to conduct a review of the Bank's management with an emphasis on anti-corruption policies and programs in several of the largest borrowing countries, including Indonesia, Russia, and Brazil. While the Bank limited GAO's access to documents, and set up a special committee to supervise their work, they still did an excellent job.

In brief, the GAO concluded the Bank has launched an ambitious effort to identify problems, but significant challenges lie ahead. We are a long way from real solutions.

Let me tick off some of the conclusions which concerned me the most—

First, although the World Bank has established an Investigations Unit which answers to a new Fraud and Oversight Committee, many local problems in borrowing countries never reach the investigators. In one country where the Bank itself identified corruption as a serious problem, 30 allegations of abuse reported to their local officials had not been referred on to the Investigations Unit or Committee.

Second, both the Investigations Unit and the Committee answer to one of the Bank's Managing Directors. GAO concluded that the independence of investigations could be compromised by the fact that a Managing Director controls the unit's budgets and makes final decisions on whether an investigation is pursued, including those that may involve employees who answer to the Director.

Third, new initiatives introduced in 1998 to improve financial and procurement procedures only apply to 14% of the Bank's 1,500 projects. In recent audits, 17 of 25 borrowers showed a lack of understanding or noncompliance with procurement rules. GAO's review of 12 randomly selected projects identified 5 projects where the borrowing countries implementing agencies had little or no experience managing projects.

Fourth, when making project recommendations for Board approval, the

staff's risk analysis fails to adequately address corruption or undue political influence as key factors. Eight of Twelve projects reviewed did not identify corruption or political manipulation as a critical risk even though other Bank reports indicated both were serious issues in the countries included in the project sampling.

Finally, GAO determined that solving problems is made more difficult because audits are often late and of poor quality, and the Bank does not evaluate the quality of audits.

To remedy these problems, GAO recommends the Bank integrate the investigative function and establish its organizational independence, include more complete corruption data in risk assessments and country strategies, develop a system for allocating anti-corruption assistance, improve borrowing countries' capabilities to monitor, implement and supervise fraud free projects, and improve auditing and project supervision.

These problems are not unique to the World Bank. We have all read the stories about the IMF being caught by surprise in both Russia and Ukraine regarding manipulation of loans and loan data. I am sure there are similar problems in the regional institutions as well.

To accelerate a solution to these pressing issues, Senator LEAHY and I felt it was prudent for the Secretary of the Treasury to encourage these institutions to implement GAO's recommendations. The amendment before the Senate requires the Secretary to withhold 10% of our contribution to each institution until audits are in place, independent investigation units are established, and the problem of corruption is being addressed in risk assessments. We also expect the institutions to strengthen local government capacity so that lending and projects are better supervised to prevent corruption.

This amendment addresses one of the most fundamental issues which has compromised support for the multilateral banks. Bringing more transparency to lending and improving procurement and management procedures will help restore confidence and support to the banks.

## AMENDMENT NO. 3511

Mr. ROBERTS. I support the Baucus-Roberts amendment to engage china on the important issue of rapid industrialization and the environment. The amendment would permit appropriated funds for the US-Asia Environmental Partnership (USAEP)—an initiative of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—to be used for environmental projects in the People's Republic of China (PRC). In other words, the U.S. government would finally be able to, for example, help U.S. businesses connect with provincial and

municipal governments in China to initiate badly needed environmental engineering projects. This work is necessary to attempt to prevent a possible long-term environmental catastrophe resulting from intense industrialization and development in the PRC and Asia in general.

Why should one care whether Chinese or Asian people breathe clean air or drink clean water? Besides the obvious humanitarian concern, a ruined environment throughout Asia will—at some point—affect us here in the United States and our interests. This is common sense.

The Baucus-Roberts amendment also sends a strong pro-engagement message to the PRC since the U.S. excluded *de jure* or *de facto* the PRC from U.S. foreign aid programs with passage and signing of the FY 90-FY 91 State Department Authorization, specifically section 902 of H.R. 3792.

Our government purports to be concerned about global environmental issues, Mr. President, about avoiding contamination of the world's water, air, and soil. Yet, we prohibit ourselves from consulting and cooperating on a government to government basis with the one nation with the greatest potential to impact the world's environment over the next 50 to 100 years. That makes no sense.

What is the United States-Asian Environmental Partnership? It is a public-private initiative implemented by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Its aim is to encourage environmentally sustainable development in Asia as that region industrializes at a phenomenal rate. By "environmentally sustainable development," we mean industrial and urban development that does not irreparably damage the air, water, and soil necessary for life. It's really that simple. US-AEP currently works with governments and industries in Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam. In creating US-AEP, the U.S. government recognized the long-term environmental hazards of Asia's rapid industrialization and the need for the U.S. government to engage on the issue.

The program provides grants to U.S. companies for the purpose of facilitating the transfer of environmentally sound and energy-efficient technologies to the Asia/Pacific region. Again, the objective is to address the pollution and health challenges of rapid industrialization while stimulating demand for U.S. technologies. In cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce, US-AEP has placed Environmental Technology Representatives in 11 Asian countries to identify trade opportunities for U.S. companies and coordinate meetings between potential Asian and U.S. business partners.

Mr. President, on the basic issue of the global environmental impact of

Asian industrialization, specifically Chinese modernization, the Senate has the responsibility to authorize at least some cooperation between Beijing and Washington. I ask for my colleagues support for this common sense amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3501

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding about my purpose in offering this amendment, which would reduce funding in the bill by a total of \$21 million for programs to combat tuberculosis and malaria. The funding for these activities was included at my request, and I want to express my appreciation to Chairman MCCONNELL for that.

Like every Senator, I would like to see the highest possible levels of funding to combat these two dreaded diseases, which cause immeasurable suffering in developing countries. I have worked to do that for several years, and I fully intend to continue doing so. If our FY01 budget allocation would permit it, I would recommend higher funding for global health programs, including to combat TB and malaria.

However, we are forced to make excruciating choices. I want to be sure that we allocate our resources wisely, and that we also have sufficient resources to support vital programs to combat anti-microbial resistance, which is a worldwide problem of great urgency and immense proportions, and to strengthen disease surveillance in developing countries.

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that in addition to providing increased funding above the current levels for programs to combat TB and malaria, we are also able to at least maintain, and preferable increase funding for anti-microbial resistance and surveillance. My hope is that effects of this amendment will only be temporary, that we will receive a higher allocation in the Conference, and that we will then be able to provide higher levels of funding for all of these critically important health activities.

AMENDMENT NO. 3512

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this amendment would allow the United States to provide non military education and anti corruption assistance to countries, and their governments, that are not on the terrorism list, and that are denied U.S. assistance or are under U.S. sanctions. Let me just reiterate that this amendment is not applicable to countries on the terrorism list or which are major producers or traffickers in illegal drugs.

This provision is specifically intended to enable the U.S. Government to conduct a broad range of rule of law programs, as well as other programs (e.g. setting up elementary schools, high school exchanges, health education, economic reform measures; tax reform, tariff regulation, developing rational and transparent budgeting

procedures, privatization, or drafting a commercial code, etc.), so long as there is some component of the program that includes educating or providing information to persons.

Mr. President, the United States has been working for a long time to try to find ways to help the most vulnerable populations around the world. Allowing the United States to continue to provide assistance in education and anti corruption training is something which ultimately is in our own interests.

In many parts of the world, we are up against elements like the Wahhabis, the Saudis, the Iranians and the likes of Bin Laden and others, who are pouring money into the poorest regions of the world to set up schools which are dedicated to teaching children anti-Western attitudes, as well as how to carry weapons.

In many countries, because of the dire poverty, such schools are the only game in town. And the single common element which allows these schools to flourish is poverty and ignorance. There is no other option for many people. The poverty and the lack of education leads to radicalism, and violence, often directed first against women, and a host of problems which every one on this floor can list.

The growth of this radicalism comes back and haunts us and affect American lives and American security. The popularity of Bin Laden for example, and the anti-Western fervor which is rampant in the Middle East and South Asia can too often lead to terrorism and attempts to destabilize developing countries that are trying to remain secular and pro-west. Ultimately, this is a threat to U.S. security.

This lack of education also leads to tragic global phenomena like the trafficking in women and children: Education would substantially increase awareness regarding the insidious practice of international sex slavery. This involves forcing women and children into prostitution against their will, who are held in slavery-like conditions, having been transported into a strange country.

There is a general sentiment in the Congress these days that sanctions have gone too far, that they don't work and that we should remove all of them. I do not share this view, I believe sanctions have a role to play and are appropriate in certain situations. But denying ourselves the opportunity to provide education in a variety of fields in certain parts of the world is counterproductive. We are only hurting ourselves.

Instead of being able to implement education programs which would help bring a secular alternative to the lack of education, or the types of schools I mentioned earlier, we find our hands are tied when assistance is denied to a country or when general sanctions are imposed on a country—including sanctions on countries that for one reason

or another default on their loans. Yes, we should be able to take political action against countries that are doing bad things; but we should not be put in a situation where programs in education or in anti corruption training is involved. We shouldn't be mandating sanctions in an area, like education, which are of long term assistance to the United States.

We sit and complain about such things as corruption or lack of environmental awareness, or lack of democracy, or child labor, or trafficking in women and children. Education could help make a dent in such things, from helping to set up elementary schools, having exchanges at higher school levels, to such things as providing information to people in such areas as economic reform, equitable distribution of wealth, growing their economies, implementation of tax reform and tariff regulation, development of rational and transparent budgeting procedures, development of rule of law and democratic institutions, and privatizing or drafting a commercial code.

And yet we occasionally find ourselves in the position of having to deny assistance in the very area which would help fix these problems.

That is why I am introducing this amendment today. Denying U.S. assistance to a country is a right we should preserve, but we shouldn't be cutting our ability to influence countries at such a basic level as education and we certainly should do what we can to combat anti-corruption.

The most effective way to overcome the anti democratic threats and the lure of terrorism is to go to the root of the problem and to encourage the development of civil society.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized to offer an amendment relative to Colombia.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I got a last-minute call from the Budget Committee, and we may have to work this amendment out. I will wait about 5 minutes before I offer the amendment. I am waiting for some last-minute wording.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. What is the situation now? Is there an amendment pending? Are we open for general debate on the foreign operations appropriations bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina sent up an

amendment by unanimous consent, and the regular order is to recognize the Senator from Minnesota to offer an amendment.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to use leader time at this point to speak with regard to the Wellstone amendment, which I understand he will be offering momentarily.

I rise to speak against the Wellstone amendment that I understand will be offered. What this amendment would do would be to knock out the funds that are included in the foreign operations appropriations bill for Colombian aid. Is that correct about the intent of the amendment by the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, no, it is not. This amendment leaves several hundred million dollars out of the \$900 million that would go to the southern Colombia military campaign. I will talk about the military and the right-wing violence groups and go through State Department reports and human rights reports about this. But in no way, shape, or form does this amendment say that.

Mr. LOTT. You would move a significant portion of the funds in excess of \$900 million into another category to be used for exactly what? Will the Senator describe that to me?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to. We are working on this final wording because we are trying to figure whether to do this out of emergency designation or whether we can do this in a different way.

What this amendment says is that we absolutely are committed to institutional building in Colombia; we are committed to helping out in every way, shape, or form, including interdiction and police action.

There are very serious concerns that have been raised by a whole range of religious groups. I have a list of hundreds of nongovernment organizations in Colombia, but a particular portion, \$225 million, would go to this one military campaign in southern Colombia. This money instead would say—and this follows up on what General McCaffrey and others have said, which is that we also need to deal not just with interdiction but also the demand side in this country.

I say to the majority leader, I am going to be presenting compelling evidence about the huge gap in the number of people who are not getting any treatment. We have to figure out a way to cut down on the demand side in our country so we will provide money for prevention and treatment programs in this country.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

At this time, rather than just speaking against his amendment, I will speak for what is in the foreign operations appropriations bill for the Colombia aid package. As a matter of

fact, the Senate version has over \$900 million in this area. The House bill actually included around \$1.7 billion because the House included not only funds for the drug war in Colombia—I believe they also provided more than what had been asked for by the administration—they also provided some aid for other countries in the area that are also having some difficulty in fighting the drug situation in that part of the world.

Let me emphasize that we have been very much involved, obviously, in being supportive of bringing about a peaceful solution in Kosovo. It has been, of course, debated what should be done there, if we should do what we have done there, and how much should be spent there. The administration has pursued the policy there and the Congress has gone along with it, for better or for worse, at a cost of billions of dollars.

I point out on this map the area we are talking about. Kosovo is in this area of the world. It is very important to Europe and to our allies in Europe. I have suggested to our allies—NATO, Germany, Britain and other countries—they should assume more of the responsibility there, not less. I have been very concerned they have not met their responsibilities. Until just very recently, they seemed to be doing a better job of providing the money and the people they committed.

My point is while this is important, it is not nearly as close and as directly involved in the U.S. national security as the situation in Colombia. This map depicts Colombia. This whole region is experiencing some transition now. Since we have turned over the Panama Canal and closed our bases there, we see evidence that already there has been an increase of drug trafficking through Panama. We are concerned about the narcotraffickers in Colombia; we are concerned about what is happening in Venezuela, and this whole region of the world. It is in our neighborhood.

For years, to our own detriment, in my opinion, we have not been as involved with Central America and South America as we should have been. Now we see democracy and economic opportunity beginning to make progress in Central America, in the Caribbean, and democracy at least blossoming in parts of South America, but we see a threat, and it is being driven by drugs.

In addition to being in our hemisphere and in close proximity, we are talking about activities by people who are undermining the Colombian Government, who are killing people, and who are killing our children. The drugs that come out of Colombia are coming right into the United States—cocaine and heroin. They are poisoning our children.

I take this not very well. I am very concerned about it. I think we ignore it



to our own peril. Should we do more in our country to deal with the demand problem, education, and treatment? Sure. We ought to find ways to do that. But we shouldn't do it by taking away from the efforts that are underway in Colombia.

That is why I call this a close national security interest for our own country. There are those who are worried if we do this, we are slipping toward being involved. Where better to be involved than to try to take action and provide support for people who are trying to move toward greater democracy and greater economic development and to control and stop the drug trafficking and the drug pushers in that part of the world? I think we should do this. I think we should have been doing more a year ago or 2 years ago. I worked in the Senate with Senators COVERDELL, DEWINE, and others in communication with our own drug czar in America that we were not doing enough in Colombia.

Finally, the administration has said, well, we need to do something more; we need to be involved. I commend them for that. We need to get it done. That is why we pulled this foreign operations appropriations bill up as early as possible. We think we should get this foreign operations bill done and we should get the Colombian aid package included. This is very important for us.

President Pastrana of Colombia has asked for our help—not to solve the problem for him. We are not advocating U.S. troops go in or that we have direct involvement in their efforts there but to help him without American troops. Give them the aid they need; give them the equipment they need to fight these massive narcotic drug cartels in Colombia and that part of the world.

President Clinton's plan is multifaceted: Economic, political, social, and military means to gain the upper hand in dealing with the narcoterrorists who control vast amounts of Colombian territory. That is an area where I have some concern. I think too much territory has been conceded to these narcoterrorists.

Make no mistake, the FARC and the ELN guerrillas are ruthless. They don't know anything or care anything about human rights. They only want power to turn Colombia into the first nation controlled by narcoterrorists. Think about that. That is a real possibility unless we act to get assistance there as soon as possible.

Will this aid package alone solve the problem overnight? No. I emphasize again we should have been doing more last year and the year before and over a period of years. But it will make a significant contribution by giving to the Colombian Government the wherewithal to challenge these narcoterrorists.

We know one thing for certain: Without this package, these narcoterrorists

will be emboldened and they will have no incentive to come to the peace table. The freely elected pro U.S. government of President Pastrana will be dealt a very serious blow. We cannot leave them unassisted when they have asked for our help.

This is a question of standing up for our children, of standing up and fighting these narcoterrorists in our part of the world, in our neighborhood, in our region. Colombia has a chance. They are tired of the bloodshed. They are tired of kidnappings. They are tired of human rights abuses on all sides. I don't for a minute mean to push aside the complaints about some of the human rights violations on the other side, but that shouldn't be a reason not to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, support the foreign operations bill as it is, with the Colombian aid. As a matter of fact, I think it is possible the aid may actually be increased somewhat in conference. We should not let this be pecked apart. We should step up to our responsibility and fulfill our commitment to Colombia, to President Pastrana for his efforts, but particularly for the children of our country.

Do not support amendments that will take away funds in this package and move them over into other areas. It is the minimum that we should do.

I thank Senator WELLSTONE for allowing me to go forward at this time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader, I appreciate his comments and I did not want to interrupt him while he was speaking.

I will, in as thoughtful a way as possible, respond to some of his comments. I don't think there is any question that we need to deal with narcoterrorists. I don't really believe that is the issue. I will take time to develop this.

My colleague from New York wanted to speak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to follow the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, more than 80 percent of the cocaine, and most of the heroin flooding America's streets comes from Colombia. That is just one of many reasons why helping honest Colombians is an urgent and absolute necessity.

Today, Colombia's democratically elected government is besieged by blood-thirsty communist guerrillas who have gone into business with narcotraffickers, and, Mr. President, without U.S. help, Colombia may very well lose its fight with these narcoterrorists—and that is why the United States must move swiftly to

help President Andres Pastrana save the second oldest democracy in the Americas.

I support doing whatever it takes to save Colombia—not only because of the enormous cost of drugs to our country but because the United States of America should stand with a decent, democratic government in our own hemisphere that is threatened by Marxist terrorist groups.

I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the able Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, for including in the foreign operations bill the emergency anti-drug assistance for Colombia and surrounding countries.

This bill deserves our support even though I expect that the House-Senate conference will choose to make some adjustments.

For example, we must resist unrealistic conditions that will block the delivery of badly needed support. Also, I am persuaded that we must supply the Colombian Army with Blackhawk helicopters so they have the mobility to respond to the hit-and-run tactics of the guerrillas who are part of the drug trade.

The stakes are enormously high. Colombia is one of the most important U.S. trading partners in the Americas, with \$4.5 billion in direct U.S. investment in sectors—not counting the key petroleum sector. Also, the guerrillas have expressly targeted American businesses and citizens in Colombia for bombings, kidnappings, and murders.

Further, the threat to regional stability is acute: Venezuela, Peru, and Ecuador all have massed troops on their borders with Colombia. Panama, which has no army, is helpless to secure its frontier from smugglers of drugs and weapons.

President Pastrana doesn't ask us to do his fighting for him. In fact, no man alive has taken more risks for peace. If anything, he might be criticized for making too many concessions to bring the guerrillas to the peace table.

The guerrillas have responded by launching murderous attacks on civilian targets. While President Pastrana is going the extra mile for peace, the guerrillas have launched a recruitment drive—bent on tearing Colombia apart.

These guerrillas are criminals and terrorists who thrive on drug trafficking, kidnapping, and extortion. They are playing an ever-increasing role in the drug trade, which earns them a blank check from the narcotraffickers who realize that chaos is good for their dirty enterprise.

These 20,000 guerrillas move about the country virtually unchallenged while most of Colombia's army is pinned down protecting bridges, oil pipelines, and power stations from terrorist attacks. That leaves only 40,000 soldiers, with a mere 30 helicopters, to take on the guerrillas in a rugged,

mountainous country almost twice the size of Texas.

What can the United States do to help?

We can approve emergency anti-drug aid to Colombia and to her neighbors, thereby giving them a fighting chance to stem the tide of lawlessness and cocaine that threatens the entire Andean region.

U.S. support will bolster the Colombian army's counter-drug battalions, providing continued U.S. military training, better intelligence and communications, and increased mobility in the form of transport helicopters. We will also provide support to eradicate illegal crops and create alternative employment for displaced farmers.

Current U.S. law requires that any military units receiving U.S. aid must be "scrubbed" for human rights violations. That is as it should be. But we should not hold U.S. support hostage to unrealistic preconditions.

If America fails to act, Colombia will continue to hurdle toward chaos. If the war drags on—or if desperate Colombians lose their struggle or are forced to appease the narco-guerrillas—the United States and the rest of the hemisphere will pay a very dear price.

The longer we delay, the higher that price will be.

I urge Senators to support emergency anti-drug support for Colombia—and to do so without delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota. Without objection, the Senator's time will be charged under the previous order against his time on the amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we are working on the final version of the amendment, but I will outline for colleagues what this amendment is about. I will send the amendment to the desk in a short while.

This amendment would essentially transfer \$225 million—as I said to the majority leader, this is by no means an amendment that says we don't supply assistance to Colombia—from the Colombian military for purposes of the push into southern Colombia to the domestic drug treatment programs.

Specifically, this amendment would transfer funds to the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant program to provide—I will marshal evidence to colleagues—desperately needed funds for State and local community-based programs and for drug treatment programs within a variety of different facilities, such as correctional facilities and other facilities in the country.

By the way, part of the argument that I present today is that we deal with this drug problem for sure, but there is a considerable amount of evidence that we don't want to all of a sudden militarize this whole package, especially with the record of the military in Colombia.

Moreover, we want to deal with the demand side in our country. By the way, I am sure the vast majority of people in the United States of America agree.

This amendment leaves substantial assistance for the Colombian Government and civil society, including all sorts of alternative development programs such as judicial reform and human rights programs.

I want to make this clear, given some of the comments of the majority leader. It also leaves extensive funding for interdiction, investigating, and prosecuting drug trafficking and money laundering, and for the counter-narcotics effort of the Colombian national police, as well as for other counter-narcotics programs in other Latin American countries. It doesn't cut 1 cent from any of that.

I want colleagues to know what they are voting on. It simply removes and transfers to more effective domestic use the resources in this particular bill destined for the Colombian Army's push into southern Colombia.

Since 1989, virtually all U.S. assistance to Colombia has officially been intended to fight illicit drug production and trafficking. The majority leader comes to the floor and speaks as if we have not been making this effort. But what is sold as a war on drugs to the Congress and the American public is far more complex. This is where I dissent from the majority leader. This is much more complex than just a war dealing with drug production and trafficking.

Colombia today is embroiled in the hemisphere's largest and longest civil war with the military increasingly linked to paramilitary death squads.

The majority leader says this is just a matter of whether or not we are serious about the war on drugs. That is not what this amendment deals with. I am serious about the war on drugs. I am serious about interdiction. I am serious about getting the assistance to Colombia for that. But when the majority leader says: I am concerned about human rights, he then quickly brushes this aside.

We need to understand that there is a civil war in Colombia. There is a military link to paramilitary death squads with massive corruption and widespread human rights atrocities. The rebel insurgency has also expanded throughout large sections of the country, and innocent civilians have been killed by these rebels as well. Colombia now has the third largest internally displaced population in the world.

Before I go any further, since we are now by a 7-to-1 ratio going to change our assistance from police to military—that is what worries me with American advisers—let me talk about the military.

Let me, first of all, quote from the 1999 country reports on human rights

practices released by the U.S. Department of State, February 25, 2000.

Paramilitary groups and guerrillas attack at increasing levels unarmed civilians expected of loyalty to an opposing party in the country.

Government forces continue to commit numerous serious abuses, including extrajudicial killings, at a level that was roughly similar to that of 1998. Despite some prosecutions and convictions, the authorities rarely brought officers of the security forces and the police charged with human rights offenses to justice, and impunity remains a problem. At times, the security forces collaborated with paramilitary groups that committed abuses.

Paramilitary groups and guerrillas were responsible for the vast majority of political and extrajudicial killings during the year. Throughout the country, paramilitary groups killed, tortured, and threatened civilians suspected of sympathizing with guerrillas with an orchestrated campaign of terrorizing them into fleeing their homes thereby depriving guerrillas of civilian support.

This report goes on. It basically says you have the military directly linked to these paramilitary groups which have committed widespread abuses of human rights and which have murdered innocent civilians.

I am all for interdiction. But I have to raise some questions about what we are doing all of a sudden in this package by dramatically changing the ratio of our support and giving much more to the military linked to these death squads. I don't think that is what our country is about.

Moreover, I don't believe the militarization of this package will work. I will get to that in a moment.

The majority leader says he is concerned about human rights. He said it in a word or two. But I would like to spend a little bit more time on this.

"Human Rights Watch World Report 2000," in Colombia.

Paramilitary groups working in some areas with the tolerance and open support of the armed forces continue to massacre civilians, commit selected killings and special terror.

Democratic Senators and Republican Senators, now we are going to give this military, given this record, a massive infusion of money for a campaign in southern Colombia with American advisers with them.

Let me quote again from the "Human Rights Watch World Report 2000." That is this year.

Paramilitary groups working in some areas with the tolerance and open support of the armed forces continue to massacre civilians, commit selected killings and special terror.

I argue that we should take this seriously.

Amnesty International, May 3, 2000:

Jesús Ramiro Zapata, human rights defender, was abducted and killed in Segovia, department of Antioquia. Several days earlier he reported that members of paramilitary groups had inquired into his whereabouts eight times in the latter part of April. On the 3rd of April, 500 paramilitaries



reportedly entered the municipalities of Segovia and Remedios, setting up camp in Otu. The large number of Colombian National Army 4th Brigade troops stationed in the area did nothing to confront the illegal paramilitary group.

That is a report from Amnesty International.

I could go on.

The armed forces, the military that we are now going to provide money to with American advisers watching and standing by idly as paramilitary groups violate human rights, abduct innocent people and murder them, and we are going to be providing all of this support for this military?

Colleagues, if there had been some evidence over the last couple of years that there has been a change, that would be a different story.

This is a letter from a number of different religious organizations in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of these documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL ACTION CENTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ABUSE COUNSELORS (NAADAC), NATIONAL COUNCIL ON ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG DEPENDENCE (NCADD), PARTNERSHIP FOR RECOVERY, STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF ADDICTION SERVICES (SAAS),

May 18, 2000.

SUPPORT THE WELLSTONE AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

DEAR SENATORS: We are writing in support of Senator Wellstone's Amendment to the Foreign Operations appropriations bill to transfer \$225 million from the section of the bill funding military operations in Southern Colombia to drug and alcohol treatment and prevention programs funded by the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) block grant. We feel this amendment leaves intact critical assistance for democracy stabilization and drug interdiction efforts in Colombia, while also supporting the vastly underfunded drug and alcohol treatment and prevention programs here in the United States.

Public funding for treatment primarily serves low income and indigent people who are seeking treatment in order to reclaim their lives. When looking at drug and alcohol addiction, we find that in addition to being a disease itself, it is a critical risk factor for health problems such as the spread of HIV and other infectious diseases as well as social problems such as crime and domestic violence.

Additionally, treatment and prevention systems have faced increased pressure from entitlement reforms, specifically welfare and SSI program reforms that decrease system capacity while increasing the need for public treatment and prevention services. Successful criminal justice programs involving (and often mandating) treatment, including drug courts, have proliferated and are steadily increasing the demand for treatment.

We feel that a balanced approach to the drug control effort is necessary, yet prevention and treatment programs have not received adequate funding to keep up with de-

mand. The Wellstone amendment adds necessary prevention and treatment funds to domestic programs that will save lives and taxpayer dollars.

On behalf of the 18 million Americans who chronically use drugs or alcohol and the 8.3 million children whose parent(s) abuse drugs or alcohol, we ask that you support drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs by supporting the Wellstone amendment.

We thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

TOM MCDANIELS,

*Director of National Policy, Legal Action Center.*

WILLIAM D. MCCOLL, Esq.,

*Executive Director, National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors (NAADAC).*

SARAH KAYSON,

*Public Policy Director, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence (NCADD).*

CAROL MCDAID,

*Partnership for Recovery.*

ART SCHUT,

*President, State Associations of Addiction Services (SAAS).*

#### 1999 COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES COLOMBIA

Colombia is a constitutional, multiparty democracy, in which the Liberal and Conservative parties have long dominated politics. Citizens elected President Andres Pastrana of the Conservative Party and a bicameral legislature controlled by the Liberal Party in generally free, fair, and transparent elections in 1998, despite attempts at intimidation and fraud by paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and narcotics traffickers. The civilian judiciary is largely independent of government influence, although the suborning or intimidation of judges, witnesses, and prosecutors by those indicated is common.

The Government continued to face a serious challenge to its control over the national territory, as longstanding and widespread internal armed conflict and rampant violence—both political and criminal—persisted. The principal participants were government security forces, paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and narcotics traffickers. In some areas government forces were engaged in combat with guerrillas or narcotics traffickers, while in others paramilitary groups fought guerrillas, and in still others guerrillas attacked demobilized members of rival guerrilla factions. Paramilitary groups and guerrillas attacked at increasing levels unarmed civilians suspected of loyalty to an opposing party in the conflict. The two major guerrilla groups, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and the National Liberation Army (ELN), consist of an estimated 11,000 to 17,000 full-time combatants organized into more than 100 semi-autonomous groups. The FARC and the ELN, along with other smaller groups, exercised a significant degree of influence and initiated armed action in nearly 1,000 of the country's 1,085 municipalities during the year, compared with 700 municipalities in 1998. The major guerrilla organizations received a significant part of their revenues (in the hun-

dreds of millions of dollars) from fees levied on narcotics production and trafficking. Guerrillas and paramilitary groups supplanted absent state institutions in many sparsely populated areas of the national territory. In July 1998, then-President-elect Pastrana met with the FARC's leader, "Manuel Marulanda Velez," and agreed to a demilitarized zone ("despeje") in which the two sides could pursue direct peace talks. In November 1998, the despeje was initiated in 5 southern municipalities, with a total population of approximately 100,000 persons. Security forces completed their withdrawal from the area the following month. In January Marulanda failed to appear for the scheduled formal inauguration of peace talks in the despeje. President Pastrana and Marulanda met again in May and agreed on an agenda for formal negotiations and on procedures for the creation of an international verification commission to monitor both sides' compliance with the terms of the despeje. However, the FARC refused to proceed with the establishment of the commission. Formal Government-FARC peace negotiations began in earnest in October and were underway at year's end, following the Government's concession to the FARC that, at least initially, there be no international verification commission. The Government also held a series of informal discussions with the ELN during the year, but insisted on the ELN's release of the victims of specific mass kidnappings as a condition for undertaking formal negotiations and for demilitarizing a zone in which the ELN could hold its national convention. At year's end, the ELN had not complied with the Government's request and still held captive several dozen of the specified kidnap victims.

The civilian-led Ministry of Defense is responsible for internal security and oversees both the armed forces and the National Police, although civilian management of the armed forces is limited. The security forces include armed state law enforcement, investigative, and military authorities, including the National Police, army, air force, navy, marines, coast guard, the Administrative Department of Security (DAS), and the Prosecutor General's Technical Corps of Investigators (CTI). The army, air force, navy, marines, coast guard, and National Police fall under the direction of the Minister of Defense. The DAS, which has broad intelligence gathering, law enforcement, and investigative authority, reports directly to the President, but is directed by a law enforcement professional. The police are charged formally with maintaining internal order and security, but in practice law enforcement responsibilities often were shared with the army, especially in rural areas. The security forces regularly failed to confront paramilitary groups, and members of the security forces sometimes illegally collaborated with paramilitary forces. The armed forces and the police committed numerous, serious violations of human rights throughout the year.

Despite years of drug- and politically related violence, the economy is diverse and developed. However, the economy has suffered a recession, and there was negative growth of 5 percent in 1999 for the first time in the country's modern history. The Government has privatized many public-sector entities and liberalized trade and financial activity since 1991, and it plans further privatizations. Crude oil, coal, coffee, and cut flowers are the principal legal exports. Narcotics traffickers continued to control

large tracts of land and other assets and exerted influence throughout society, the economy, and political life. The official unemployment rate peaked at 20 percent, a record high, although it had declined to 18.1 percent by year's end. Inflation at year's end was 9.2 percent. The Government passed an austere budget to address the fiscal gap, which was at 6 percent of gross domestic product (GDP), and has prepared reform proposals in areas such as pensions and regional finance. The balance of payments deficit was 4.5 percent of GDP. Income distribution is highly skewed; much of the population lives in poverty. Per capita GDP was approximately \$2,100.

The Government's human rights record remained poor; there was some improvement in several areas, and the Pastrana administration took measures to initiate structural reform, but serious problems remain. Government forces continued to commit numerous, serious abuses, including extrajudicial killings, at a level that was roughly similar to that of 1998. Despite some prosecutions and convictions, the authorities rarely brought officers of the security forces and the police charged with human rights offenses to justice, and impunity remains a problem. At times the security forces collaborated with paramilitary groups that committed abuses; in some instances, individual members of the security forces actively collaborated with members of paramilitary groups by passing them through roadblocks, sharing intelligence, and providing them with ammunition. Paramilitary forces find a ready support base within the military and police, as well as local civilian elites in many areas.

On August 12, President Pastrana signed into law a revised Military Penal Code, which includes provisions that unit commanders no longer may judge their subordinates; that an independent judge advocate general corps is to be created; and that troops are to be protected legally if they refuse to carry out illegal orders to commit human rights abuses. However, necessary implementing legislation had not been passed at year's end. Also on August 12, the Government made public the Government's national human rights plan, which includes a provision that permits the armed forces commander to remove from service summarily any military member whose performance in combating paramilitary forces he deemed "unsatisfactory or insufficient." The State demonstrated an increased willingness to remove from duty security force officers who failed to respect human rights, or ignored or were complicit in the abuses committed by paramilitary groups. The Government removed four army general officers from service during the year; the generals were under investigation for collaborating with or failing to combat paramilitary groups. A few other state security officers were removed from service or suspended during the year. The military judiciary demonstrated an increased willingness to turn cases involving security force officers accused of serious human rights violations over to the civilian judiciary, as required by a 1997 Constitutional Court ruling; however, concerns about impunity within the military judiciary remained.

Police, prison guards, and military forces continued to torture and mistreat detainees. Conditions in the overcrowded prisons are generally harsh; however, some inmates use bribes or intimidation to obtain more favorable treatment. Arbitrary arrest and detention, as well as prolonged pretrial detention,

are fundamental problems. The civilian judiciary is inefficient, severely overburdened by a large case backlog, and undermined by intimidation and the prevailing climate of impunity. This situation remains at the core of the country's human rights problems. The Superior Judicial Council (CSJ) reported in August that 63 percent of crimes go unreported, and that 40 percent of all reported crimes go unpunished. The use of "faceless" prosecutors, judges, and witnesses, under cover of anonymity for security reasons, continued until June 30, in cases involving kidnapping, extortion, narcotics trafficking, terrorism, and in several hundred high-profile cases involving human rights violations. Human rights groups accused these courts of violating fundamental rights of due process, including the right to a public trial. On June 30, a "specialized jurisdiction" replaced the anonymous regional court system. The specialized jurisdiction prosecuted and tried cases of extortion, narcotics trafficking, money laundering, terrorism, and serious human rights violations, including massacres, some homicides, torture, and kidnapping. It permitted the use of anonymous witnesses and prosecutor in exceptional cases that potentially placed their lives in danger.

The authorities sometimes infringed on citizens' privacy rights. Journalists practices self-censorship. There were some restrictions on freedom of movement. There were unconfirmed reports of security forces harassing or threatening human rights groups. Violence and extensive societal discrimination against women, abuse of children, and child prostitution are serious problems. Extensive societal discrimination against the indigenous and minorities continued. Child labor is a widespread problem. Trafficking in women and girls for the purpose of forced prostitution is a problem. "Social cleansing" killings of street children, prostitutes, homosexuals, and others deemed socially undesirable by paramilitary groups, guerrillas, and vigilante groups continued to be a serious problem.

Paramilitary groups and guerrillas were responsible for the vast majority of political and extrajudicial killings during the year. Throughout the country, paramilitary groups killed, tortured, and threatened civilians suspected of sympathizing with guerrillas in an orchestrated campaign to terrorize them into fleeing their homes, thereby depriving guerrillas of civilian support. Paramilitary forces were responsible for an increasing number of massacres and other politically motivated killings. They also fought guerrillas for control of some lucrative coca-growing regions and engaged directly in narcotics production and trafficking. The AUC paramilitary umbrella organization, whose membership totaled approximately 5,000 to 7,000 armed combatants, exercised increasing influence during the year, extending its presence through violence and intimidation into areas previously under guerrilla control. Although some paramilitary groups reflect rural residents' desire to organize solely for self-defense, others are vigilante organizations, and still others are actually the paid private armies of narcotics traffickers or large landowners. Popular support for these organizations grew during the year, as guerrilla violence increased in the face of a slowly evolving peace process. The army's record in dealing with paramilitary groups remained mixed. In some locations the army on rare occasions attacked and captured members of such groups; in others it tolerated or even collaborated with paramilitary groups.

The FARC and the ELN regularly attacked civilian populations, committed massacres and summary executions, and killed medical and religious personnel. Guerrillas were responsible for the majority of cases of forcible recruitment of indigenous people and of hundreds of children; they also were responsible for the majority of kidnappings. Guerrillas held more than 1,000 kidnaped civilians, with ransom payments serving as an important source of revenue. Other kidnap victims were killed. In some places, guerrillas collected "war taxes," forced members of the citizenry into their ranks, forced small farmers to sow illicit crops, and regulated travel, commerce, and other activities.

U.S. AID TO COLOMBIA,  
March 8, 2000.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing as religious leaders in the United States to urge you to oppose the two-year \$1.3 billion military aid package for the "Push into Southern Colombia" proposed by President Clinton on January 11. This aid targeting the coca growing regions of southern Colombia will escalate the violence and undercut efforts for a negotiated peace settlement to Colombia's 40-year civil war. We urge you instead to support much-needed assistance for peace, human rights, justice reform, alternative development, and humanitarian assistance to Colombia's internally displaced.

Colombia is currently the third largest recipient of U.S. military assistance. Yet reports from the United Nations, the U.S. Department of State, independent human rights organizations, and Colombian judicial authorities point to continuing ties between the Colombian security forces and brutal paramilitary groups responsible for massacres, assassinations of community leaders and human rights defenders, and over 70% of Colombia's human rights abuses. A report released by Human Rights Watch this month links half of Colombia's 18 brigade-level army units to paramilitary activity.

Colombia's internal conflict has produced 1.6 million internally displaced persons, more than in Kosovo or East Timor, and an increasing number of refugees fleeing to Panama and Venezuela. It is our fear the proposed aid package will draw the U.S. deeper into Colombia's civil war, intensify the conflict, and make the U.S. complicit in violations of human rights. Even more disturbing, the proposed aid package includes plans for intensive aerial fumigation that will displace 10,000 more people from southern Colombia, forcing them off of their lands and deeper into the fragile rainforests, causing great human suffering and incalculable environment damage.

Aerial fumigation of coca cultivation in Colombia has failed to reduce coca production in Colombia or consumption in the United States. Between 1992 and 1998 the area under coca cultivation has increased from 40,000 to 100,000 hectares despite huge increases in U.S. assistance for weapons, training, and intelligence. This proposed aid package will only expand a failed war on drugs by increasing military force, while failing to address the complex political, economic, and social inequalities at the root of Colombia's internal conflict.

On October 24, 1999, more than 10 million Colombians marched for peace. Talks between the Colombian government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the largest guerrilla force, have resumed. Progress is being made toward opening negotiations with the National Liberation Army (ELN), the second largest guerrilla group. We ask you to honestly assess

the possible negative effects on U.S. military aid on those peace efforts. It is our judgment that such aid will undermine them. We urge you to vote against increased U.S. military involvement in Colombia.

RAQUEL RODRIGUEZ,  
*Program Associate,  
Latin American and  
Caribbean Office,  
Global Ministries,  
United Church of  
Christ—Disciples of  
Christ.*

DAVID A. VARGAS,  
*Executive for Latin  
America and the  
Caribbean Global  
Ministries, United  
Church of Christ—  
Disciples of Christ.*

THOM WHITE WOLF  
FASSETT,  
*General Secretary,  
United Methodist  
Church, General  
Board of Church  
amid Society.*

STEVEN BENNETT,  
*Executive Director,  
Witness for Peace.*

Mr. WELLSTONE. They are opposed to this aid package for the push into southern Colombia, again with the same concern about the basic violation of human rights and the close connection between the armed services and these paramilitary terrorist organizations.

Mr. President, I also have here a document which is from Human Rights Nongovernmental Organizations and the Peace Movement in Colombia.

I ask unanimous consent this be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLOMBIA ANSWERS PLAN COLOMBIA: A PLAN FOR PEACE OR A PLAN FOR WAR?  
(A Declaration From Social and Human Rights Nongovernmental Organizations, and the Peace Movement in Colombia, Bogotá, May 31, 2000)

We would like express our support for those offers of international assistance that contribute to resolving the armed conflict through a process of political negotiation, and that strengthen and unite Colombian society and the economy. We support proposals that include viable and integral solutions to the problem of drug trafficking, the design of a new development model agreed to by the people, and the strengthening of a new kind of democratic institutionality.

However, Plan Colombia, presented by the Government of President Pastrana, has been developed with the same logic of political and social exclusion that has been one of the structural causes of the conflict Colombians have experienced since the time of our formation as a Republic.

In this same vein, because we feel it is a mistake, we are obligated to reject the fact that Plan Colombia includes, as one of its strategies, a military component that not only fails to resolve the narcotrafficking problem, but also endangers the efforts to build peace, increases illicit crop production, violates the Amazonian ecosystem, aggravates the humanitarian and human rights crisis, multiplies the problem of forced dis-

placement, and worsens the social crisis with fiscal adjustment policies. In its social component, the Plan is limited to attending to some of the tangential causes and effects of the conflict.

What we are proposing is the need for a concerted agreement between different actors in Colombian society and the international community, one where civil society is the principal interlocutor, where solutions to the varied conflicts are found, and where stable and sustainable peace is constructed. We are ready and willing to design strategies, to define forms of implementation and to monitor a plan that reflects these intentions.

Taking into consideration the arguments put forth above, we the undersigned are given no choice but to reject the U.S. assistance for Colombia that you are considering at this time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will quote one section:

In this same vein, because we feel it is a mistake—

They are talking about this package—

we are obliged to reject the fact that Plan Colombia includes as one of its strategies, a military component that not only fails to resolve the narcotrafficking problem—

I say to the majority leader and others, “that fails to resolve this problem,” but that is what we want to do, is resolve the problem—

but also endangers the efforts to build peace, increases illicit crop production, violates the Amazonian ecosystem, aggravates the humanitarian and human rights crisis, multiplies the problem of forced displacement, and worsens the social crisis with fiscal adjustment policies.

It is from a variety of about 70 nongovernment organizations, including religious organizations as well, in the country of Colombia. They are saying don't do this. Provide the assistance; we need it. Let's get it to the civic-building organizations, get it to the police, get it to some of the interdiction efforts, get it to some other economic development efforts. But don't put the money into the military for this campaign, given the military's record of torture, murder, and widespread violation of human rights.

In short, continuing to pursue our current Colombia counterinsurgency policy, cloaked under the veil of antinarcotics efforts—that is not what this is about. This is not about an antinarcotics effort. That is not what the vote is about. The vote is about whether or not you are going to put money into this military anti-insurgency effort. It risks drawing us into a terrible quagmire. History has repeatedly shown, especially in Latin America—just think of Nicaragua or El Salvador—that the practical effect of this strategy now under consideration is to militarize, to escalate the conflict, not to end it. That is, I think, the flaw in this package.

The call by the administration for a massive increase in counternarcotics assistance for Colombia this year puts

the United States at a crossroads. Do we back a major escalation in military aid to Colombia that may worsen a civil war that has already raged for decades or do we pursue a more effective policy of stabilizing Colombia by promoting sustainable development, strengthening civilian democratic institutions, and attacking the drug market by investing in prevention and treatment at home—the demand side of the equation, right here in our own country?

The decision to fund the Colombian Army's push into southern Colombia is an enormous policy shift. It represents a 7-to-1 shift in funding from the Colombian police to the army. General McCaffrey says the purpose of Plan Colombia is to help the Colombian Army recover the southern part of the country now under guerrilla control. But honestly, if the purpose of this military aid is to stop drug trafficking, should some of that aid not target the northern part of Colombia as well? Something strange is going on here. If we want to deal with the people who are involved in drug trafficking, then one would think we would also have a campaign in the northern part of Colombia. There you have the right-wing death squads involved. Colombia is currently the largest recipient of U.S. security assistance. It is exceeded only by Israel and Egypt. Foreign aid and other assistance to Colombia, since 1995, now totals \$739 million. Yet the administration's own estimate shows a 140-percent increase in Colombia coca cultivation over the past 5 years.

Colombia now produces 80 percent of the world's cocaine. Drugs today are cheaper and more available than ever before. If the drug war was evaluated like most other Federal programs, I suspect we would have tried different strategies a long time ago. More weapons and more soldiers have not and cannot defeat the source of illegal narcotics. While the Colombian Government and people merit our assistance, more money for guns is not the answer to Colombia's troubles or our own troubles with the serious use of drugs right here in our own country.

Being tough on drugs is important. But we also need to be smart about the tactics we employ. No one disagrees that Colombia faces a difficult challenge and we should respond to President Pastrana's call for help to combat illegal drug trafficking. I agree. President Pastrana has argued that U.S. support is necessary to “strengthen democratic institutions, stop the flow of drugs, and bring peace to the country.” I agree.

I would support the army's push into southern Colombia if I felt this proposal would make that happen. But, in fact, I think a military push would have the exact opposite effect by weakening democratic institutions and bringing more hardship to the Colombian people. There is not anything in

the world we can do, by way of monitoring this, to make sure that this military—which has been so clearly linked to these right-wing death squads and terrorist organizations—will change its practice.

Amnesty International, the State Department report, "Human Rights World Watch Report"—I could spend hours just reading from these reports on the atrocities committed by the military, or the atrocities committed by these death squads, these paramilitary organizations toward which the military basically has turned a blind eye. Now we are going to provide the money for this military, for a military campaign, with American advisers, in the southern part of Colombia? That is what is problematical about this.

At the same time, however, forces from within Colombia threaten democracy. Paramilitary groups operating with the acquiescence or open support of the military—the very military we are going to support—account for most of the political violence in Colombia today. I need to make that point.

Yes to interdiction, yes to going after drug trafficking—but understand that this is a country in civil war. This is a country with the largest internally displaced population, maybe in the world, certainly in the hemisphere. And this is a country where too many innocent civilians are murdered. This is a country where paramilitary groups, operating with the acquiescence or open support of the military, account for most of the political violence.

Yet Colombia's military leaders have not taken a firm stand or taken clear steps necessary to purge human rights abusers from their ranks. The evidence is clear. They have taken no steps to purge human rights abusers from their ranks. They have acquiesced to these human rights abuses. Sometimes they support these human rights abuses. And we are going to provide this money for this military with American advisers?

I support the addition to this bill that requires conditions on assistance based on human rights concerns. But just as the Committee on Appropriations noted in its committee report to this bill, I, too, "have grave reservations." I quote from the Committee on Appropriations:

... grave reservations regarding the Administration's ability to effectively manage the use of these resources to achieve the expected results of reducing production and supply of cocaine while protecting human rights.

Human rights organizations have detailed abundant and compelling evidence of continuing ties between the Colombian Army and paramilitary groups responsible for gross human rights violations. In its annual report for 1999, Human Rights Watch reports:

[I]n 1999 paramilitary [groups] were considered responsible for 78 percent of the total number of human rights and international humanitarian law violations [in Colombia.]

Human Rights Watch collected this evidence with the help of the Colombian Commission of Jurists, a highly respected human rights watchdog within Colombia. It has also collected evidence linking half of Colombia's 18 brigade-level army units to paramilitary activity.

In other words, military support for paramilitaries remains national in scope and includes areas where units receiving or scheduled to receive U.S. military aid operate. This is quite unbelievable. I hope all Senators will consider this seriously when they vote on this amendment.

I was also given a book detailing the human rights situation in Colombia by the Twin Cities Chapter of the Colombia Support Network. This organization is working to establish a sister-city relationship with the war-torn town of San Pablo in southern Colombia. San Pablo is directly in the path of the suggested push into southern Colombia. This is just one of hundreds, if not thousands, of heartbreaking stories:

A young woman, with a confused and almost hopeless air about her, answered my questions and spoke into my taperecorder. She had been forced to join a military patrol and walk for 13 days through the mountains, guiding the soldiers and carrying their knapsacks. Although she witnessed numerous cases of torture and the destruction and burning of humble campesino dwellings, it was the brutal murder of Jesus Pastrana which affected her the most. I myself had met this campesino leader on one of his visits to Bogota to attend meetings of ANUC (a national peasants organization with strong support during this period). According to the terrible details the young woman gave me, Chucho, as Jesus was affectionately called, died a slow and agonizing death on October 31, 1981. He was hung from a tree as psychopathic soldiers cut off his ears, his fingers, hands, then arms and testicles and finally shot him 21 times.

Other colleagues have come to the floor to speak, and I want to make sure they speak.

If this were an isolated example and if I did not have in hand the evidence from respected human rights organizations and the State Department reports of blatant violation of human rights now of these paramilitary organizations committing so many of these atrocities, most of the violence, with the military acquiescing and sometimes linked to it and supporting it, with no evidence the military is taking any steps to purge its ranks of human rights abusers, I might think better of this dramatic change in our package, 7 to 1 from military to police, for a campaign in southern Colombia with American advisers, putting us in the middle of the civil war aligned with this military.

I want to have aid for Colombia. I want President Pastrana to have our

support, but this effort will not be successful. Moreover, I think, we are, on very treacherous ground, moving into this area.

I will summarize so that other colleagues may speak.

We could put this money into the demand side. I am simply saying we take \$225 million, leaving \$700 million, or thereabouts, and we put it into the substance abuse prevention and treatment block grant program which basically is a block grant to our States. Whether or not we are talking about the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy or whether or not we are talking about the data that is collected in our States, we are talking about a situation where 50 percent of adults or more and 80 percent of adolescents or more who need treatment are receiving no treatment because we do not have the funds for the treatment programs.

Our police chiefs tell us drug abuse is the most serious problem in their community. They also identify a shortage of treatment programs as a real limitation on their ability to deal with it.

We know from study after study—and I will talk more about this when I have more time—that money put into treatment programs pays for itself over and over. I have dramatic statistics and data I will present, but the long and the short of it is, if we have this package and if there are questions to be raised about the militarization of this aid, putting the money into the military for the southern campaign, a military directly linked to human rights violations, with so many organizations in Colombia saying do not do this, it will lead to more violence; do not do this, America, you could be sucked into this conflict; at the same time, we could provide a significant package into building democratic institutions for economic aid, \$700 million, and we could take a tiny portion of it and deal with the demand side for drugs in our own country, which is also critically important, and get the funding to the community level that would help us provide some treatment for people, that is a win-win situation.

I hope this amendment will receive strong support from my colleagues.

AMENDMENT NO. 3518

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for the substance abuse and mental health services)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 3518.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 143, line 9, insert before the period the following: “: *Provided further*, That, subject to the 2 preceding provisos, of the funds appropriated for military purposes under this heading for the ‘Push into Southern Colombia’, \$225,000,000 shall be made available to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration for carrying out subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Services Act (42 U.S.C. 300x-21 et seq.): *Provided further*, That amounts made available under the preceding proviso are hereby designated by the Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be made available only after submission to the Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act”.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 26 minutes and has 64 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I sent this amendment on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment that has been offered by my friend and colleague from Minnesota. I commend him for his commitment to drug use reduction. He and I serve on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. We have worked on a number of bills having to do with this very topic, including the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program.

Ultimately, however, this amendment is, I am afraid, attempting to reallocate resources from one part of our antidrug strategy to another. The amendment raises important questions about the effectiveness of our entire strategy and opens, I believe, an important and necessary discussion about our drug control policy in this country.

The sad fact is that since almost the beginning of the last decade, our antidrug strategy has not worked. More children are abusing drugs, and with an abundant supply, drug traffickers are seeking to increase their sales by targeting children ages 10, 11, 12, and 13. This is certainly an assault on the future of our children, an assault on our families, and an assault on the future of our country. This is nothing less than a threat to our national values and, yes, a threat to our national security.

All of this, though, begs the question: What are we doing wrong? Clearly, there is not one simple answer. However, in 1998, a bipartisan group of Senators—myself; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. COVERDELL; the Senator from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY; and the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN—

worked together to deal with this problem. We came to the conclusion that our overall drug strategy simply was no longer balanced. I want to talk about this because I am afraid what my colleague is doing is not helpful as we attempt to balance our antidrug strategy.

We have been working together since 1998 to restore that balance. The emergency assistance antidrug package for Colombia contained in this bill is part of that effort to restore this balance, but even with this, we still have a long way to go.

The fact is, to be effective, our national drug strategy must have a strong commitment in three different areas: No. 1 is demand reduction which consists of prevention, treatment, and education. The Federal Government in this area shares responsibility to reduce that demand, along with State and local governments, local community groups, nonprofit organizations, and families.

When you are dealing with education, when you are dealing with treatment, you are dealing with something that is a shared responsibility between the Federal Government and the local communities.

The second component is domestic law enforcement. Again, in this area, it is a shared responsibility among the Federal Government, the local communities, and the States. Again, the Federal Government has a shared responsibility to use law enforcement resources, along with the State and local governments, to detect and dismantle drug trafficking operations within our borders.

We witnessed a successful return on that investment last week on what was called Operation Tar Pit, when the Justice Department announced it had worked with State and local law enforcement agencies in 12 cities, including 2 in the State of Ohio, to dismantle a major Mexican heroin trafficking organization. They did a great job, in a coordinated effort.

The third component in any successful antidrug strategy is international eradication and international interdiction. This is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. States can't help. Local communities can't help. We are the only ones who can do this. I am afraid my colleague's amendment strikes directly at our attempt to do this.

Like our national defense and immigration policies, only the Federal Government has the authority, only the Federal Government has the responsibility to keep drugs from ever crossing our borders. If we do not do it, no one else will. No one else can. The buck stops in this Chamber.

These three components are all interdependent. We need to have them all. A strong investment in each is necessary for them to work individually and to work collectively.

For example, a strong effort to destroy or seize drugs at the source or outside the United States both reduces the amount of drugs in the country and drives up the street price. As we all know, higher prices do in fact reduce consumption. This, in turn, helps our domestic law enforcement and demand-reduction efforts.

As any football fan knows, a winning team is one that plays well at all three phases of the sport: Offense, defense, and the special teams. The same is true with our antidrug strategy. All three components have to be supported if our strategy is to be a winning one.

While I think the current administration has shown a clear commitment to demand-reduction and domestic law enforcement programs, the same, sadly, cannot be said for our international eradication and interdiction components. This was not always the case.

I think these charts I have will show how our commitment has changed.

In 1987, a \$4.79 billion Federal drug control budget was divided as follows: 29 percent for demand-reduction programs, 38 percent for domestic law enforcement, and 33 percent—one-third—for international eradication and interdiction efforts. This is the way it should be. This is a balanced program. This is what we had in 1987.

Now we fast forward to 1995, and you will see that this balance goes out of whack. We no longer had that balance. We no longer had that balance today.

The balanced approach worked. It achieved real success. Limiting drug availability through interdiction drove up the street price of drugs, reduced drug purity levels, and as a result reduced overall drug use.

From 1988 to 1991, total drug use declined by 13 percent, cocaine use dropped by 35 percent, and overall drug use by American adolescents dropped by 25 percent—results. We began to see results.

This balanced approach, however, ended in 1993. By 1995, the \$13.3 billion national drug control budget was divided as follows: 35 percent for demand reduction, 53 percent for domestic law enforcement, but only 12 percent for international interdiction efforts. International interdiction efforts have gone down to 12 percent from 33 percent.

Though the overall antidrug budget increased almost threefold from 1987 to 1995, the percentage allocated for international eradication and interdiction efforts decreased dramatically. This disruption only recently has started to change.

We have put together, on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives, a bipartisan group—a bipartisan group of Senators—who have said: We cannot have this imbalance. We must begin to restore the balance we had a few years ago in 1987. We have to do it.

Let me go forward, if I may, to this current budget year, the budget year 2000. In the budget year 2000, 34 percent has been allocated for demand reduction, 51 percent for domestic law enforcement, and 14.4 percent for international interdiction efforts.

We are slowly moving in the right direction. Even in this year's budget we have a long way to go, with only 14.4 percent for international interdiction efforts. We have more work to do, more work, such as the assistance package for the Colombians that we are debating on the floor today. But we are starting to see some modest progress.

But what really matters is what these numbers get you, what they buy us as a country, what they buy in terms of resources. The hard truth is that our drug interdiction presence—the ships, the air, and the manpower dedicated to keeping drugs from reaching our country—has eroded dramatically over the course of the last decade. We are just now starting to restore those valuable resources.

In fact, with the modest improvements we have made in our international drug fighting capability, we have seen progress. In 1999, for example, the U.S. Coast Guard seized 57 tons of cocaine with a street value of \$4 billion. By the way, that is more than the total operational costs of the Coast Guard. These operations demonstrate we can make a big difference, a very big difference, if we provide the right levels of material and the right levels of manpower to fight drug trafficking. It worked before. It can work again.

The emergency assistance package we are talking about today, along with investments included in the Senate-passed military construction appropriations bill, is designed to build on that success. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, while it is very well intentioned, simply, effectively robs Peter to pay Paul just as Paul is getting back on his feet again. Just look at the example I mentioned earlier.

Through my visits to the Caribbean, Colombia, and Peru in the last several years, I have seen firsthand the dramatic decline in our eradication and interdiction capability. The results of this decline have been a decline in cocaine seizures, a decline in the price of cocaine, and an increase in drug use in the United States.

We have to turn this around. This is why we need emergency assistance to Colombia. We need to dedicate more resources for international efforts to help reverse this trend. We have to restore the balance.

I want to make it very clear, as I have time and time again, that I strongly support our continued commitment to demand reduction and to law enforcement programs in the United States. No one is a stronger supporter of these. It has to be a bal-

anced program where we have money for treatment, where we have money for education, where we have money for domestic interdiction and law enforcement.

My concern is not that this amendment is not well intentioned, not that we should not be putting more resources in this area. My concern is what this does to the other side of the component, and that is international drug interdiction.

Let me make it clear. We do need this balanced program. I believe that reducing demand is the only real way to permanently end illegal drug use. However, this is not going to happen overnight. That is why we need a comprehensive counterdrug strategy that addresses all components of this problem.

Let me say again, if the United States does not make an effort to stop drugs before they reach our borders, no one else will. It is the Federal Government's responsibility. I remind my colleagues that our antidrug efforts here at home are done in cooperation with a vast number of public and private interests. Only the Federal Government has the ability and the responsibility to help deal with the problem at the source level overseas. Only the Federal Government has the ability to stop drugs in the transit routes. This is our responsibility; the buck stops with us.

It is not only an issue of responsibility. It also is an issue of leadership. The United States has to demonstrate leadership on an international level, especially in our own hemisphere, if we expect to get the full cooperation of source countries where the drugs originate, countries such as Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, as well as countries in the transit zones, including Mexico and Haiti.

In conclusion, ultimately what we are striving for is a balanced, effective antidrug strategy. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota; we can and should do more to reduce demand but not at the expense of our sole responsibility to stop drugs abroad. That would not result in the balanced approach we are looking for today. That is what we need to aim for, balance and effectiveness. It worked before; I believe it can work again.

If my colleague from Kentucky will indulge me, I will respond to a couple comments that have been made by my colleague from Minnesota. This bill is full of human rights, if I may say it that way. It is full of attempts by the U.S. Government to condition the money we send to Colombia and the money that will be spent in the antidrug effort. We have doubled the money for human rights monitoring. We have established conditions before the money can be released, including the fact that human rights violations must be prosecuted in civilian courts pursuant to Colombia law; troops will be vetted for abuse.

Ultimately, the question my colleague from Minnesota is raising is a fundamental question: Will we back away from our responsibilities in this hemisphere—our responsibility to a fellow democracy, our responsibility to our own citizens to protect us from drugs coming from Colombia into the United States? Will we back away from that, wash our hands of it and say we don't want to get involved in this, or will we become involved only in the sense that we condition the money that we send to Colombia on very tough conditions, great respect for human rights, and see what we can do in that arena?

I think we are better off staying. We can have more impact; we can have more influence; and it is the right thing to do. It is in our national interest. With this bill, my colleague from Kentucky brings to the floor a balanced approach, a logical approach, an approach that is very concerned about human rights, a bill that is concerned about our obligations to ourselves and our obligations in this hemisphere.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his important contribution to this debate. He is a real expert on the drug war. He has demonstrated that expertise over the 5 years he has been here. I thank him for his important contribution.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 27½ minutes remaining.

AMENDMENT NOS. 3476, 3164, AND 3514, RECALLED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in the package of amendments submitted earlier today, three amendments currently filed at the desk were included. I ask unanimous consent that amendment Nos. 3476, 3164, and 3514 be recalled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. The distinguished Senator from Illinois is here and wishes to speak, as well as the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I have 27 minutes remaining. How much does my friend from Illinois desire; 10 minutes? I yield to the Senator from Illinois 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, since there are a lot of Senators here on the other side, I will take 2 minutes to respond to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McCONNELL. As long as it is on the time of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I would be pleased for it to be on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to the Senator from Ohio, this effort to deal with



the demand side and to get some substance abuse prevention and treatment moneys to our States and our communities, I have no doubt the Senator from Ohio is very committed to that. I look forward to working with him on this because, frankly, I think it is a scandal. We have so much evidence—Bill Moyers, the impressive journalist, has done such fine work on this—that we can treat this addiction, that we can make a huge difference. Senator MOYNIHAN has spoken with such eloquence about the whole history of our efforts to constantly try to militarize and go for interdiction and not deal with the demand side. It is a completely one-sided proposition. I look forward to enlisting the support of my colleague from Ohio on this question. I know he will be there.

I will wait to respond to other Senators. I know Senator DURBIN is going to speak and Senator BIDEN. As I listen to my colleagues, what I am hearing—and I think we should be explicit about this—is that this is not just a question of a kind of war on narcotics. Otherwise, we would be doing more on the demand side. This is a question of basically saying that we can't just focus on the police. We can't just provide help to the government for police action and building democratic institutions and economic development and every other kind of assistance possible. We have to directly provide the money for the military to basically conduct their anti-insurgency campaign in the southern part of Colombia with American advisers and support. I believe that means we are taking sides. If we are taking sides and we are now in the middle of this war, so be it. That is what I am hearing on the floor. I wanted to comment on that.

I retain the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding.

Sunday afternoon, 3 days ago, I was in southern Colombia in a Blackhawk helicopter. We spent an hour going over the treetops of a jungle and looking down. A general from the Colombian army was pointing out to me the fields of coca plants, the plant that ultimately produces cocaine. After a few minutes, I told him he could stop because we could literally see them in every direction. I am talking about 600 square miles of coca plants growing a product which has one use: to create an addictive narcotic. Where will it be sold? Right here, most of it in the United States.

I think we all know the devastation it wreaks on this country. The likelihood that one will be robbed or murdered is usually connected to narcotics. The safety of American homes, neighborhoods, and communities is usually connected to narcotics. The prisons of America are bursting at the seams pri-

marily because of narcotics. Eighty percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States comes from one country: Colombia. That is a reality; that is a fact.

The Senator from Minnesota is one of my favorite colleagues. I say this in all sincerity. Thank God PAUL WELLSTONE is in the Senate. He stands for principle on so many issues and reminds all of us of the issues of conscience which should be part of every debate.

I am honored so many times to stand as his ally. This is one of the rare occasions when I am on the opposite side and will oppose his amendment. As some would like to construct it, this amendment is a Faustian choice, an impossible dilemma. Should we allow drugs into the United States? Certainly not. Should we support a Colombian military that has a record of human rights abuse? Well, certainly not. But we have to make a choice here.

The Clinton administration has come forward, working with the President of Colombia, and said we think we can find a way to reform the military and we can also reduce the narcotics coming into the United States.

I might add that I salute Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY for this fine bill they have brought to us. They went further than the administration. Please read the section on Plan Colombia, and you will see page after page of efforts by Democrats and Republicans here to address the very real human rights concerns raised by Senator WELLSTONE of Minnesota.

Time and again, they come forward and say we are going to do more and make certain, as best we can, that before money comes from our Treasury down to Colombia to eradicate narcotics, the people receiving the money are not going to collaborate with the narcotraffickers who are guilty of things that have been proven in the past.

I salute the committee. For friends of mine in the human rights community in the United States, I hope they will read what has been done here by Senators LEAHY and MCCONNELL. It is very positive.

Imagine, for 40 years Colombia has been involved in what has been called a civil war or an internal conflict. What does that mean? Forty years ago, groups on the left who were inspired either by Moscow, or Beijing, or whatever, came to the front and said, we are going to push for reform in this country so that the poor people of Colombia have a better chance. That sort of revolution was taking place all over Central and South America.

But things changed over 40 years. What started off as a leftist-inspired, popular uprising to improve life for the poor people in Colombia quickly became subsumed and taken over by the narcotics trade. The World Bank estimates that there is a billion dollars in

money coming into Colombia to sustain the narcotics trade. That money is going to the leftist guerrillas and the right-wing group, the terrorist paramilitaries. They all use the same tactics. They don't go into villages and beg for soldiers; they stick a gun to their heads and say, "You are now part of our paramilitary group." They enslave them. If they don't cooperate, they kill them. And they are involved in kidnapping.

The President of that country has been kidnapped. His father-in-law was kidnapped and murdered. When we met Saturday morning, the Defense Minister said his brother was kidnapped. Everybody there told stories about kidnapped people. If you think this is a typical civil war where the left is moving for poor people and the government is against it, it doesn't fit the description. When we sat down with the human rights groups, they said the guerrillas on the left and the paramilitaries on the right are just as guilty of human rights abuses in this country as any other group. No question about it.

There are very few good guys in this story. But from the U.S. point of view, I think the President is right, and I think this bill is right to say we cannot stand idly by and let these drugs flood into the United States with all of the negative consequences.

I totally support Senator WELLSTONE's premise that if we just stop the supply of drugs coming into the United States, that is not enough; we have to deal with the demand side of it. America is a great consumer of narcotics. That is why those plants are being grown thousands of miles away. When Senators WELLSTONE and DEWINE come to the floor and say put more money into drug prevention and rehab in the United States, they are right. But it is not an either/or situation; we need both.

This bill addresses reducing and eliminating the supply of narcotics coming into the United States. Senator WELLSTONE believes the military in Colombia has a record of human rights abuses, and he is right. The State Department stands behind that. This bill addresses that and says, we will bird-dog you every step of the way, demand reforms in the Colombian society, and we will demand that you not be engaged in human rights abuses to be part of this partnership to reduce narcotics in Colombia.

I might also add, to suggest we will give money to the police and not to the army really doesn't tell the whole story. They are together in Colombia. The national police and the army are together. When I sat down with the Minister of Defense, I sat across the table from General Gilibert, who is head of the police, and General Tapias, head of the army. They work together. We want to use helicopters to secure

areas where we can send down planes to spray with Roundup these coca plants and kill them, so that coca is not turned into paste and white powder and sold on the streets of Washington, DC, and Chicago, IL, addicting people and sending them to prison after committing crimes. That is a good thing to do. I support the administration in their efforts to achieve that.

It is true that Senator WELLSTONE says we may be taking sides. I hope we are taking sides against narcotics and saying to the leftist guerrillas and right-wing paramilitaries: We have no use for either one of you.

As said to me by the President of Colombia, "They are both our enemies. We have to deal with both of them." We should view it that way. As I met with the Army and Marine Corps personnel from the United States advising these troops in Tres Esquinas, a remote location in the Putumayo Province, it is clear that these men in the Colombian Army were prepared to put their lives on the line to stop the narcotrafficking that ultimately will corrupt and kill so many Americans. I think we have to stand behind them. We have no other choice. To step back and say we will do nothing now is unacceptable.

This bill makes it clear that we have not forgotten the poorest people in Colombia. I commend again the subcommittee for saying that additional assistance is given to the Agency for International Development, so that once that coca planter in Colombia has his crop sprayed, we can give him an alternative, find some other agriculture in which he can be involved. That is the humanitarian and sensible way to approach this. This bill does that; it tries to make sure some alternative, legal agriculture is available to the people there.

Is it worth a billion dollars to America to send this money to Colombia? I will use my State as an illustration. In 1987, we had 500 people in Illinois prisons for the possession of a thimbleful of cocaine. Today, we have 9,000 prisoners in Illinois for the possession of a thimbleful of cocaine. It costs us about \$30,000 per prisoner a year. The taxpayers of Illinois are spending \$270 million a year and the story can be repeated in every other State. That is \$270 million a year in Illinois because of what is growing in Putumayo Province in Colombia.

I think we have to have a coordinated effort of interdiction and stop it at its source, to do everything in our power not to let these drugs come into the country. Then we can deal with the demand side of it and see that drug rehab is available—a sensible and a balanced approach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Does the Senator from Minnesota want to respond?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is right, yes. I will just be a few minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. All right.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague for his courtesy. I know Senator BIDEN wants to speak.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator BOXER be allowed to speak after Senator BIDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, since we are setting a lineup here, I ask unanimous consent that Senator COVERDELL from Georgia come after Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague from Illinois for his very gracious remarks. A lot of times there is unnecessary flattery on the floor that may not seem sincere. I appreciate what he said. At the personal level, I thank him.

I was thinking about what my colleague from Illinois said. I want to raise a couple of quick questions as long as we are having this debate.

First of all, in terms of the explosion of the number of men and women incarcerated, I couldn't agree more.

This legislation, which is all about how to deal with the drug problem and is being billed as legislation that deals with trafficking of narcotics and trying to protect people in our own country, is very one sided. I am trying to take a portion of it and say let's deal with the demand side in our country.

Soon in this debate I will lay out all of the studies that have come out. It is a real scandal.

In the State of Illinois and my State of Minnesota, the big part of the problem is that people are not getting treatment. I am simply saying: Can't we take a portion of this legislation, which is all about trying to protect our citizens and trying to deal with this drug trafficking, and deal with the demand side? There is no real disagreement. I think most people in our country would say: Why don't we put money in the demand side and treating people right here?

My second point is that President Pastrana has made his own judgment about what he needs to do. I have tremendous respect for the President, but I think we also need to make our own judgment. In all due respect, again if we are talking about moving from police to military in a pretty dramatic way, and talking about putting ourselves right in the middle of this conflict, let's understand that we should be having a policy debate about our taking sides in this civil war.

I couldn't agree more about the left or the right. You have an unbelievable number of atrocities and murder being committed by both sides. There is no question about it. The question is

whether or not we have now decided we are going to be there with aid and our people supporting the military in this counterinsurgency effort. Are we going to take sides in this military conflict?

I hear my colleague from Delaware say yes. I always respect his directness. But I think that is really what the debate is about. I think probably all of us need to understand, since some who have come to the floor have said they are against this amendment, if they are for the war against drugs, this is not a debate about only a war on drugs, obviously from what colleagues have said. We have been down this road before. Now we are going to say we have decided that we have to support the southern Colombia military, and we are going to put the money into this military effort. If we are going to have Americans there supporting it, we are taking sides. OK. As long as that is clear.

Third, my colleague from Illinois said that the police and the military are in this together, and that they work together. I do not know. Again, I didn't have a chance to visit Colombia. But I do know, at least from sort of the one time I was in Latin America and in my own study, that I always saw in these countries a great difference between the police and the military. You see the police. They are low-level guys who do their job. The military are the "Rambos." There is a difference in the groups. They are an entirely different group of people and entirely different people.

In all due respect, the evidence we have right now by one human rights organization after another after another after another, much less the State Department report, is that about 70 percent of the violence has been committed thus far by paramilitary groups to which the military quite often is linked. We haven't been able to vet that. All of a sudden, we are going to be able to vet it, monitor it. We are going to be able to control it. I think that is a dubious proposition.

I think by militarizing this aid package we make a big mistake. I think we could support this amendment which permits extensive assistance to Colombia while safeguarding U.S. interests and avoid entanglement in a decades-old civil conflict and partnership with an army that is implicated in human rights abuses. Moreover, I think we could take some of the resources and put them where they could do the most good, which would be providing drug treatment programs at home.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, is the Senator from Kentucky able to yield time to me?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 28 minutes, and he has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCONNELL. How much time does the Senator from Delaware need?

Mr. BIDEN. I understand the Senator's dilemma.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware 12 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the Senator. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, knowing he was about to give me time, which is his nature. I appreciate that.

Mr. President, my mom had an expression. Occasionally, when I was a kid, I think she had a good idea and was well intentioned. She would say, "JOEY, the road to Hell is paved with good intentions."

I have no doubt about the intentions of my friend from Minnesota. I know he knows that as the author of the drug czar legislation for the past, I guess it is about 14 years, I have issued every year a drug report or an alternate drug report laying out a drug strategy for the United States, usually as a counterbalance on the Republican administration and criticism or one of agreement with the administration.

This debate reminds me a little bit of the position in which Democrats have always been put. The Democrats get put in a position where we are told there is a dollar left and it can be distributed among the hearing impaired, the sight impaired, and those children needing emergency medical care. So we have to choose. We have the blind fighting the disabled fighting the hearing impaired. Instead of saying we can choose between building a highway and taking care of all the needs of those in desperate need, or we cannot build a submarine, or an air base, whatever, we are debating about whether or not we can walk and chew gum at the same time.

There is no disagreement. I have, as well as my colleagues, pushed—pushed in the early days when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee—for major increases in treatment. I have issued a total of seven major reports on treatment, its value, its efficacy, and why we should be doing more.

I take a backseat to no one in arguing that we do not give enough treatment here in this drug war.

I point out that the President's budget, unrelated to the Colombian aid package, has \$6 billion in it for drug treatment and drug prevention. That total includes \$300 million in funding increases in this area. We don't have to take away from the money that, in fact, would have a significant impact on the reduction of product here. That is the bad news.

The good news is that, as we have debated the Andean drug policy for the

past 12 years, we used to have to deal with the idea that Colombia was a transiting country as well as a country that turned raw product into the materials sold, and the laboratory work and product used to be produced in Bolivia and Peru.

The good news is, because of eradication programs, because of U.N. leadership, I might add in this area, essentially there has been an elimination of the crop in those two countries.

The bad news is that it has all moved into Colombia. They now are a full-service operation. The product is there, the narcotraffickers are there, the laboratory laboratories are there, and the transiting is there. That is the bad news.

The good news is it is all in one spot for us to be able to hit it. It is all in one spot for us to have a very efficacious use of this money.

I spent days in Colombia. I spent 2 days, 24 hours a day, with the President of Colombia. I ended up actually going with him on his Easter vacation by accident to his summer residence. This is a guy, as my friend from Illinois points out, that is the real deal.

For the first time, we have a President who understands that his democracy is at stake. He is willing to risk his life—not figuratively, literally. I went to dinner with he and his children. He has seven bodyguards around his children because of the death threats. This is a guy who is risking his life. He is willing to do it because he understands what is at stake for his country, unlike previous Presidents.

The next point is, we are making this distinction between police and military. With all due respect to my friend from Minnesota, historically the thugs in South America have been the police. Police are not like police here. There is a national police; we have no national police. The Federales in Mexico were police, not army. Often the police in South America are the biggest abusers of human rights.

What did we do? We gave the Colombian National Police aid, \$750 million in aid. What did we say? Purge this police department, purge the national police, and they did. And guess what. If I stood on this floor 5 years ago and said the Colombian police are going to crack the Medellin and Cali Cartel, no one would have said that is possible. No one.

Guess what. They cracked the Medellin Cartel. They cracked the Cali Cartel. They put them in jail. They are extraditing the police. Why? Because we trained their police; they purged 4,000 of them.

Where are we on military? I met here with every major human rights group from Colombia, including the bishops who came up. When we push them to the wall and say to them: By the way, you want us out?

No, no, no, no, no, no, don't do that. Don't do that. You have to stay in. You

have to be involved. We don't like the balance the way you have it here.

I say: Fine. No problem.

Tell me, bishop, you want us in or you want us out?

Stay. Stay.

Now, civil war. There is no civil war. We are so caught up in the old logic of how we deal with things. There is no civil war. Less than 5 percent of the people of Colombia support the guerrillas. Every other guerrilla movement, every other civil war, you go into the village to recruit people. They go in, as my friend Illinois said, to shoot people. There is no popular sentiment at all. This is not a civil war.

With regard to the paramilitaries, I called President Pastrana a few weeks ago. I said, a lot of the criticism of the plan is you have to be sure that you are only focusing on the FARC and the ELN and only focusing on the guerrillas. What about the paramilitaries? I said, I want a letter guaranteeing that you will, in fact, move on the paramilitary simultaneously. You must change.

He changed it. Here is the letter. I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SANTAFÉ DE BOGOTÁ, May 8, 2000.

Senator JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,  
*Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.*

DEAR JOE: Thank you again for your visit to Colombia and your support of my country. I greatly enjoyed our discussions and valued your insights.

I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate, as I did personally during your visit here, the commitment of my government to attack drug trafficking and cultivation in all parts of the country and not only in the south, no matter what individual or organization may be promoting them.

This policy has been in effect since the beginning of my administration, generating very important results. In 1999, 51,415 hectares of coca and poppy were sprayed, 31 tons of coca and 691 kilos of heroin were seized, and 166 labs and 44 airfields were destroyed. Just this past weekend, in an extraordinarily successful operation in Norte de Santander on the border with Venezuela, we were able to destroy 44 laboratories and capture 20 persons, in an area linked to illegal auto-defense organizations, but where guerrilla groups and organized drug traffickers also operate.

Plan Colombia is an integral plan for peace designed, among other goals, to eradicate drug cultivation and to address the social problems created by the violence associated with drug trafficking in all the producing regions with an emphasis on the areas where there is the greatest cultivation and/or a marked increase in cultivation in the recent past—areas close to the Ecuadorian border in the south and to the Venezuelan border in the north. Our priorities and the sequence of eradication will depend on the resources available to us, but you are correct in stating the principle that we want to demonstrate that no trafficking organization is immune.

Indeed, as you may know the initial effort of the plan marks combined police, military,

civilian operations in the Department of Putumayo in the south where not only FARC but also auto-defense organizations are present. In that regard, the coordinated effort at drug eradication alternative development, support for the internally displaced, human rights protection, democratic governance, judicial reform and promotion of the rule of law will work to diminish drug-trafficking and violence in this fragile amazon region. We enjoyed your visit and hope to have you again as our guest. Your interest and that of your government in my nation's future strengthens our commitment and gives us crucial international support.

Sincerely,

ANDRÉS PASTRANA ARANGO,  
*President of Colombia.*

Mr. BIDEN. When I said, do we take sides? The answer is, yes, we take sides. We are not putting anybody in the field. What are we doing? We are training three battalions. Why are we training them? For the same reason we train the police. We want to open up the eyes of the Colombian military, who in recent years have been accused of fewer human rights abuses. They have been accused of turning their heads. They hear the paramilitary coming, they lift the gate, the paramilitary comes through, the paramilitary terminates people, and they go back out.

Then they ask, what happened?

That is what they are doing.

Plan Colombia does not only involve U.S. participation. This is a \$7.5 billion plan. The Colombians are coming up with \$4 billion; the Europeans, about \$1 billion and the international financial institutions about \$1 billion. If we take out our piece, it all falls apart. We are not the only game in town. But we are the catalyst. What will happen? The whole world is going to be looking to the Colombian military, from Japan to Bonn, because they are all in the deal. They are all in the deal. If you want to clean up anybody, anything, any institution, listen to the dictates of a former Supreme Court Justice: The best disinfectant is the clear light of day.

There will be a worldwide spotlight shined upon this military. I have never personally testified on the floor that I have faith in an individual leader, but I have faith in President Pastrana. He is the real deal. What is at stake is whether or not Colombia becomes a narcostate or not. This is not in between. Keep in mind, folks, when the Supreme Courts of Colombia several years ago extradited some, they blew the Court up; they blew the building up and killed seven Justices. When a Presidential candidate took them on, they shot him dead.

This is the real stuff. It is not like a Member of this body. The worst thing that happens to us is we get a drive-by shooting politically and we lose office. There, you jump in the sucker and you lose your life. This is for real. These are courageous people who finally have said: We will take them on.

I am convinced—knowing the chairman, and my friend from Kentucky is a hard-nosed guy—he made a judgment whether these guys are real. He is not about to give \$1 billion to anybody.

My colleagues, it is very basic. There is a lot at stake. We have a significant increase in funding for treatment and prevention. It should be more. But we have an obligation, in the interests of our children and the interests of the hemisphere, to keep the oldest democracy in place, to give them a fighting chance to keep from becoming a narcostate. Folks, if they lose, mark my words, we are going to reap the whirlwind in this hemisphere on matters that go far beyond drugs. It will include terrorism, it will include whole cadres of issues we have not thought about.

I thank the chairman for his time. I truly appreciate the motivation of my friend from Minnesota. At the appropriate time, unless the chairman of the committee does not want me to, I move to table. I am not trying to cut off discussion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Delaware for an important contribution and assure him at the appropriate time it would be appropriate for him to make a motion to table.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for this amendment and for this time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, listening to the Senator from Delaware, one would think the Wellstone amendment is taking away all the funding from Colombia. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Senator from Minnesota is leaving in place the funding for Colombia; that makes good sense. Here is what is left in this bill after the Senator's amendment: Funding for interdiction; funding for the Colombia police; funds for alternative development and internally displaced people; funds for human rights; funds for regional assistance; funds to rehabilitate soldiers under the age of 18 who have been involved in armed conflict.

The only thing the Senator from Minnesota is doing in his amendment is making sure this country doesn't get involved in a conflict that could hurt our people eventually. The Senator from Minnesota is saying we are going to help President Pastrana, we will help this country, we will help this region, but we are not going to get involved with the military.

I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart for this amendment. I don't care if the Senator gets 2 votes or 22 votes; he is doing the right thing.

I clearly understand the threat that illegal drugs pose to our country, to

my State of California, and I clearly understand that Colombia is a major supplier of the cocaine and heroin that reach our shores. But let me tell my friends in the Senate, we need a balanced approach to this horrible problem of drug abuse. You could have a big supply, but if no one wanted to buy it, it would not hurt anyone. The fact is, the people in this country want to buy it. And there is not 1 cent in this bill, out of \$1 billion—not 1 cent to help us with education, treatment on demand, prevention. This is a lost opportunity. What my friend from Minnesota is saying is, if we in this Chamber are sincere about fighting drugs, and a war on drugs, then we do not put \$1 billion into a foreign country and ignore what is happening here at home.

Let me tell you what happens in California and all over this country when someone is arrested for a violent crime. Mr. President, 50 percent to 75 percent of those perpetrators of this violence are high on drugs. I cannot tell you how many times when I have been in my State—maybe it is because my State is a large State—that I have someone come up to me, a parent, saying: I have a son or a daughter who wants to get off drugs; there is no room in a treatment center; we don't have money; we have to spend a lot of money; what are we going to do?

I look at that person and all I can say is: Send me a letter and let me see if we can help you find some treatment program that might have a slot.

Does it make sense to spend \$1 billion, as this bill does, and ignore the emergency here at home? We are so quick to find the money to send somewhere else, but what about our people who are ready, perhaps, to take that step to get off drugs? Telling them they have to wait 6 months to get into a program is consigning them to more months of addiction. What happens if we can stop this whole thing before it starts, with education, with prevention? I do not quite understand the enthusiasm for a bill that does not spend a penny here at home.

My friend from Delaware is as eloquent as anyone on this floor. He says, "Yes, we are spending more." Yes, we are spending more in our regular appropriation, but if we are facing such a horrible emergency that we have to go in, with \$1 billion, I have to say to my friend, why can't we see this emergency here at home, when people cannot get treatment on demand? You don't have a sale if you don't have a willing buyer. Unfortunately, the addicts are here, in this country.

Mr. BIDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am happy to.

Mr. BIDEN. Why doesn't the Senator have an amendment to take \$1 billion out of the highway trust fund or \$1 billion out of the education budget or \$1 billion out of NIH or \$1 billion out of the Department of Energy?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be glad to answer it. Because this is \$1 billion to deal with the drug problem specifically. That is the point of it. The Senator made that point. The Senator from Illinois made that point. This is money that we are spending because we are stunned at the drug trafficking that is going on—and we should be. All the Senator from Minnesota is saying in his amendment, which I am proud to support, is we will leave 75 percent of that money intact to do the things we want to do to help the good President of Colombia. But all we are saying is before we get our advisers caught in a situation over there—you know, you may be right. Maybe nothing will ever go wrong with it. But all we are saying is, how about fighting a drug war here at home for a change instead of always spending the money outside of this country?

Mr. BIDEN. Will my distinguished colleague yield for another question, just 10 seconds?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. BIDEN. The Senator is aware the President's budget calls for spending \$6 billion in drug treatment and prevention, including \$31 million for substance abuse block grants; that is \$54 million on targeted capacity expansion programs, \$37 million for research and treatment, \$5 million—the list goes on. The Senator is aware of that?

Mrs. BOXER. If I may take back my time, and I will not be able to further yield because I have such a restriction, I stated that. I gave my friend absolute assurance I understand that. We are not doing enough when 50 percent—

Mr. BIDEN. I agree.

Mrs. BOXER. Of the addicts in my State are not getting treatment. Only 50 percent can get treatment. The other 50 percent, unless they are rich, cannot get the treatment on demand.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I will.

Mr. WELLSTONE. For my colleague from California, just so she knows, the particular program we are talking about, which is the block grant, the SAMHSA block grant program to our States and communities for treatment programs, is \$1.6 billion.

My colleague's figure lumps everything and anything together.

Mr. BIDEN. On treatment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am talking about direct treatment out in the community. When 80 percent of the adolescents in this country get no treatment whatsoever, and 60 percent of the adults get no treatment whatsoever, it is hard to come out on the floor and say we have already made this tremendous commitment, there is no reason to talk about some additional resources.

Mrs. BOXER. Again, I represent the largest State in the Union. My friend

represents a smaller State. I would just say, maybe it is my State, but when I see these figures coming back—and my friend is a leader in the whole issue of crime prevention and being tough on crime and all the rest, and he knows it is true that if you look at the arrests for violent crime in our country—I could say particularly in California, 50 to 75 percent of the perpetrators are high on drugs. So all my friend from Minnesota is saying in his amendment is everything the Senator said about President Pastrana, everything he said about the need to help his country—I don't argue with that. That is why I am proud of this amendment. Everything is left in except getting us involved in this counternarcotics insurgency, which may well put us in a situation where we find ourselves between two bad actors: the FARC on the one hand, with a horrible story of violence and human rights violations, and the paramilitary on the right-hand side here, with the same horrible record. Unfortunately, it ties to the military in Colombia.

So here we are, giving us a chance to do all the good things in this appropriations bill that we are happy are in there, but to take out the one for \$225 million, that could lead us into trouble.

Here is the Boston Globe. They talk about targeting addiction. They say:

The Clinton proposal for U.S. intervention in Colombia's Civil War—

And that is what is being supported on this floor. They say it really isn't going to work. They finish saying:

History suggests that increased funding for treatment of addicts and programs for prevention—treatment on demand for drugs—can accomplish more to ameliorate the individual and social pathology associated with the endless war on drugs.

This is the Boston Globe. We have a number of editorials that are very strong on this point.

This is the St. Petersburg Times. We have these from all over the country:

Have we forgotten the lessons of our involvement in Central America in the 1980s . . . ?

They talk about the fact:

In an attempt to contain communism, our government provided support to right-wing governments and paramilitary groups that used the aid to slaughter thousands of innocent civilians. This time, America's stated public interest is stopping drug trafficking.

But, it says:

It could, however, draw us into a brutal civil war in which civilians are a target.

This would be a tragedy if we repeated that kind of scenario. We have to learn from history. I think the amendment of the Senator is protecting us from just this problem.

Washington should have learned long ago that partnership with an abusive and ineffective Latin American military rarely produces positive results and often undermines democracy in the region.

That is from the New York Times. It talks about the fact that President Pastrana is well intentioned, but all of the programs he faces, we are going to be faced with them as well.

Then, from the Detroit News:

Colombia: The Next Quagmire?

The Clinton Administration's proposed aid package intends to break the choke hold of the guerrillas by training and arming Colombia's military. The hope is that returning control to a legitimate government will help curb the illegitimate narcotrade. But this is a naive hope that ignores the other half of Colombia's gritty ground reality. The military is a corrupt institution with close links to the outlawed paramilitary groups that control the drug trade in urban areas.

It goes on. This is not Senator BOXER speaking or Senator WELLSTONE. These are editorial boards from all over the country.

We have others from California that I wanted to have printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, View Related Topics July 31, 1999]

Five American soldiers were killed in a plane crash the other day in a mountainous region of Colombia. They were on a reconnaissance flight as part of an escalating U.S. effort in support of the Colombian government's war against heavily armed narcotics traffickers.

The deaths call attention to a U.S. aid program that has grown rapidly, partly because Washington has more confidence in Colombia's new president, Andres Pastrana, than in his corrupt predecessor, and partly because of a perception that the threat to this country posed by Colombian traffickers is increasing.

That perception is strongly held by Gen. Barry McCaffrey, President Clinton's anti-narcotics chief, who says cocaine production in Colombia has doubled in three years, that 80 percent of the cocaine and heroin entering the United States comes from Colombia and that traffickers have amassed so much wealth that they can buy all the weapons and recruit all the fighters they need, especially in a time of economic hardship for most Colombians, to fend off poorly trained and underarmed government forces.

McCaffrey has called for \$1 billion in emergency U.S. aid to combat the drug trade in Latin America, most of it for Colombia, which is getting \$289 million this year—triple last year's total. (Colombia now ranks third, behind Israel and Egypt, as a U.S. aid recipient.) The money would pay for technical and intelligence assistance, and training by U.S. advisers of a newly created anti-narcotics army battalion whose mission is to attack guerrilla units, clearing the way for police (who get most U.S. aid) to move in and eradicate coca crops.

But there are serious obstacles. For one thing, U.S. aid has been meager in the past not only due to corruption but because of rampant human rights violations by soldiers and right-wing paramilitary groups. Thus the new battalion has been carefully recruited and will receive human rights training.

A larger problem is that U.S. aid is meant to target only Colombia's narcotics traffickers, not a 35-year-old leftist insurgency.

Yet the two have become virtually indistinguishable as guerrillas extort tribute from coca growers and traffic in drugs as well. The largest guerrilla group now controls much of the southern half of the country thanks to Pastrana's policy—deemed naive by many Colombians and by some U.S. officials.—of keeping troops out of the region as an inducement to the rebels to negotiate a peace settlement. But the rebels, while enjoying their immunity, have stalled negotiations.

Despite such troubling signs, McCaffrey appears to have strong support in Congress, and to some extent from the White House, for increasing U.S. aid even as drug prevention and treatment programs at home are given only minimal funding. Those priorities are misplaced.

The Pentagon insists that U.S. combat troops will not be used in Colombia. Good. But Americans have heard that before, about Vietnam, and rebels say they regard U.S. advisers as targets. While it may be premature to sound an alarm, it's not too early to begin a debate about U.S. interests in a conflict that has at least the potential to suck Americans into another quagmire. Congress and the administration owe it to the country to clarify what's at stake, what is contemplated and what is not, and the sooner the better.

[From the Fresno Bee April 5, 2000]

#### ANTI-DRUG FOLLY: U.S. AID PLAN WOULD RAISE STAKES IN COLOMBIAN CONFLICT

By a wide margin, the House of Representatives has approved \$1.7 billion to aid Colombia in its fight against drug traffickers who supply the bulk of the cocaine and heroin to the United States. The aim is laudable, but the chances of success seem slight. Before the Senate takes up the measure, which the Clinton administration strongly supports, there must an intensive national debate.

The legislation bans the use of U.S. combat troops, but allows that U.S. advisers be sent to train Colombian forces in the use of U.S. helicopters and other equipment and to ensure that American aid is used properly—in particular, that human rights are respected by specially trained Colombian anti-narcotics battalions. Such constraint is important.

But staying within those limits will be difficult, given the immense terrain involved, the history of human rights abuses in Colombia and the legislative mandate that aid can be used only against drug traffickers and not against leftist guerrillas who often collaborate with them. And if right-wing death squads that have been closely linked to elements of the Colombian military continue to operate, some of the blame will inevitably accrue to the U.S. program, fairly or not. Add to that Colombia's endemic corruption, deadly political intimidation and the ease with which drug crops can be shifted from areas eradicated and the task seems overwhelming.

Undaunted, U.S. officials want funding to be expedited. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott objects, not to aid for Colombia but to folding it into a \$12.7 billion supplemental appropriations bill that includes other military aid, domestic flood relief and various pork-barrel projects. He's right; the Colombian program is too critical to be obscured by typical election-year log-rolling.

Opponents fear, reasonably, that the United States could become ensnared in a foreign civil war that is not a vital U.S. interest and that is probably unwinnable without far more intervention than most Americans would support. Backers say that Colom-

bia's plight is a vital U.S. interest because of the impact among drug-addicted Americans. But every study, and common sense, tell us that the solution lies mostly at home—in prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs that badly need more funds.

In short, the onus is on the administration to persuade Americans that this program is not the beginning of an open-ended commitment.

U.S. aid to Colombia may be justified, but only if it is carefully defined and performance-based in terms of military success and democratic reform. Otherwise, it could turn out to be another nightmare that might have been avoided had we paid closer attention going in.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 15, 2000]

#### COLOMBIA AID BILL WOULD ESCALATE A FAILED POLICY; DRUGS: TREATMENT AND REDUCING COCAINE CONSUMPTION IS A BETTER WAY TO GO

(By Robert Dowd)

U.S. demand created the drug crisis situation in Colombia, and our military intervention there merely places American troops and civilian contractors in harm's way in an effort to salvage our failed drug policy.

The Clinton administration has proposed, and congressional Republicans seem prepared to accept, a \$1.7-billion military aid package to Colombia. This formidably expensive builds on existing aid—Colombia is already the largest recipient of U.S. military aid outside the Middle East—and involves us more deeply in a 4-decades-old civil war, as well as perpetuates programs that have failed to control drug production.

As a veteran, I know the importance of a clear military objective, of having the resources needed for success, and a clear exit strategy. In Colombia, we are sending a handful of helicopters and a few hundred of troops. Yet we were unable to control a smaller Vietnam with hundreds of helicopters and half a million troops.

The Colombia military intervention seems poorly planned, unrealistic and doomed to fail. After a few years of military support, we will face the choice of accepting defeat or gradually being pulled into an expensive military quagmire in which victory is unattainable.

The reason the U.S. is becoming more involved in Colombia's internal affairs is that our government's efforts to reduce cocaine availability have failed miserably, and drug money has strengthened the rebel armies. We already spend hundreds of millions of dollars annually to eradicate crops in South America, especially in Colombia. According to a 1999 report by the General Accounting Office, "Despite two years of extensive herbicide spraying, U.S. estimates show there has not been any net reduction in coca cultivation—net coca cultivation actually increased 50%."

Rather than escalate a failed policy, we should recognize that the present strategy cannot succeed and look for new approaches.

According to the Rand Corp., eradication is the least-effective way to reduce drug use. Rand's research found that \$34 million spent on drug treatment in the U.S. would have the same effect as \$783 million in eradication expenditures. Naturally, the less cocaine the U.S. consumes, the less incentive growers in Colombia will have to grow coca. That would be the best eradication policy.

Further, we need to face the difficult and politically controversial question of whether prohibition enforced by the drug war provides better control of the drug market than

regulation enforced by administrative law. If we want to get international cartels and urban gangs out of the drug market we must determine how to control the market through civil law rather than criminal law.

The administration's most frequent rationale for pumping millions of dollars in aid and tons of military equipment into Colombia is the need to fight "narco-guerrillas." In fact, there are reports that all sides—including the side the U.S. supports, the Colombian military—have been tied to the drug trade. It seems that we are supporting one group of drug traffickers while opposing another group.

The Colombian aid package is nothing more than an introduction to a quagmire and an escalation of failed drug policy.

The administration and Congress should step back and formulate goals they want to achieve in Colombia and then determine how best to achieve them without promoting bloodshed and lawlessness.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Does my colleague need more time?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask the Senator from Minnesota for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I yield my colleague an additional 10 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I will continue reading from some of these editorials. These are newspapers that have very different editorial policies, usually, from one another.

The Sacramento Bee:

A larger problem is that U.S. aid is meant to target only Colombia's narcotics traffickers, not a 35-year-old leftist insurgency. Yet the two have become virtually indistinguishable as guerrillas extort tribute from coca growers and traffic in drugs as well. . . .

The Pentagon insists that U.S. combat troops will not be used in Colombia.

The newspaper says that is good.

But Americans have heard that before, about Vietnam, and rebels say they regard U.S. advisers as targets.

We have the rebel groups already saying U.S. advisers will be targeted.

This is what the Sacramento Bee says. I associate myself with their conclusion:

While it may be premature to sound an alarm, it's not too early to begin a debate about U.S. interests in a conflict that has at least the potential to suck Americans into another quagmire. Congress and the administration owe it to the country to clarify what's at stake, what is contemplated and what is not, and the sooner the better.

The L.A. Times says:

The administration's most frequent rationale for pumping millions of dollars in aid and tons of military equipment into Colombia is the need to fight "narco-guerrillas." In fact, there are reports that all sides—including the side the U.S. supports, the Colombian military—have been tied to the drug trade. It seems that we are supporting one group of drug traffickers while opposing another group.

Let's look at this one. What are we doing? We have the left wing on one



side killing people, human rights violations, and violent. We have the right wing on the other side, with which the Colombian military oftentimes sides, and they are doing the same thing from the right. In comes the United States of America advisers—and I know we have some advisers there already; I am aware of that, but this is clearly an escalation of our involvement through the donation of these helicopters and advisers—and they are going to become targets in the middle between the left and the right wings.

Even though we say they are there to fight drug trafficking, which is laudable, they may well go into the jungles and encounter some of the left-wing guerrillas and find themselves in a pretty horrible situation, which is something about which we need to be clear and why I am so proud to be a co-sponsor of this amendment and why, quite frankly, I am a little surprised there is not more concern in the Senate.

There is a Fresno Bee editorial that is excellent. It says in part:

[This amendment] allows that U.S. advisers be sent to train Colombian forces in the use of U.S. helicopters and other equipment. . . . And if right-wing death squads that have been closely linked to elements of the Colombian military continue to operate, some of the blame will inevitably accrue to the U.S. program. . . .

That is another fear. What could be more important to us as Members of the Senate than making sure people do not get hurt in our country, in the world, that we work for peace and all the right things? If somehow our dollars wind up helping paramilitary groups and they commit human rights abuses and killings—and we know the list of these abuses; they are horrible—somehow it is definitely going to come back to us. It is going to come back to us, and I do not want that on my hands. I do not want that on the hands of the people from my State.

The Senator from Minnesota is giving us today an opportunity to do all the good things we should do in Colombia. I will go through them again. There are important things he has left in this bill.

He is only taking out 25 percent of this money and transferring it to this country to help us in a war on drugs in our Nation.

He is leaving in interdiction, \$132 million to pay for new aircraft, upgrades for existing aircraft, secure communications, sea- and river-based interdiction.

He is leaving in \$93 million for Colombian police to pay for spray aircraft, helicopter upgrade, communications, ammunition, equipment.

He is leaving in funds for alternative development for internally displaced people, \$109 million—funds to help displaced people.

He is leaving in human-rights-boosting government capabilities. This fund-

ing would provide for the protection of human rights workers, judicial reform, training of judges, prison security—all the things President Pastrana needs to strengthen the institutions in Colombia.

He is leaving in regional assistance for Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. This funding would be used for alternative development programs in these nearby countries.

He is leaving in \$5 million to help rehabilitate child soldiers, children who got involved in this conflict.

For people to talk against this amendment as if it is eviscerating aid to Colombia, eviscerating aid to President Pastrana, they have not read the Wellstone amendment. The only thing he is taking out is this involvement on the ground with this counterinsurgency against the narcotics.

As I look around my State and I read the studies from my State—for example, in Ventura County, CA, a beautiful part of our State where there is a lot of agriculture and open space and it looks like paradise, 40 percent of the county's homeless population is related to drug abuse or alcohol abuse. A San Francisco study found in 1998 that drug abuse was the leading killer of the homeless. There are over 500,000 drug-related emergency room episodes every year.

In 1995, nationwide, drug abuse cost \$12 billion in health care—\$12 billion in health care costs—and the good Senator is suggesting \$225 million so we can cut down on those expenses. It is an investment to cut down on these costs.

The loss of productivity in 1992 has been calculated at \$69.4 billion. That is a 1-year loss of productivity.

In summing up, I consider myself someone who is good at solving problems, and the way one solves problems is not putting blinders on and going in one direction, but looking at the whole problem. With the Wellstone amendment, taking \$225 million and putting it in this country so we can stop people from becoming addicts and, if they are addicts, help them get off drugs, this is going to be a really good and balanced bill, one that I will be proud to support.

Again, I thank him for leaving in this package the kinds of things we need to do to build democracy in Colombia, to make sure that regime succeeds, to train the people who need to be trained in judicial reform, to help human rights, to help the child soldiers, and to take that \$225 million that will involve us, unwittingly, in what I consider to be a civil war, to take that out, bring it home—bring it home to California, bring it home to Georgia, bring it home to Minnesota, bring it home to New Hampshire, bring it home to our cities and our counties—and let people get the help they need, the help they deserve.

So I say to my friend, thank you for your courage in offering this. I am proud to stand with you.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield it back to the Senator from Minnesota.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I know the Senator from Georgia is here. I just want to thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 10 minutes of our time and, of course, reserve the remainder of the time when I conclude my remarks for our side.

We have heard a lot of interesting remarks. I rise against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Delaware.

I would like to try to not repeat everything that has been said but try to underscore several fundamental basic points with regard to these issues.

The first is that over the last 8 years, funding for drug treatment and drug prevention has increased by \$1.6 billion. I repeat, it has increased over the last 8 years. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would increase it even further.

On the interdiction side of the ledger, during the same 8 years, there has been a decrease in the funding for interdiction. So interdiction is dropping and treatment and prevention is growing.

What happens when the Federal Government moves away from its responsibilities to protect our borders and to engage international narcotics entities? I can tell you what happens. The United States is flooded with more drugs—because there is nothing there to stop that—the price of those drugs plummets, and more of our children become addicted to narcotics. Almost the reverse of what this amendment seeks to achieve happens.

As of Friday, June 9, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention gave us these alarming figures. In 1991—so this is the same timeframe I have been talking about—14.7 percent, about 15 percent, said they used marijuana. Who is “they”? They are 9-year-olds to 12-year-olds—children 9 years old. By 1999, the figure was 27 percent.

This is the period we are all talking about here, where our interdiction dropped and where we increased treatment and prevention. What has happened? We have had more and more youngsters—kids, children—using drugs.

In 1991, 31 percent of students reported they tried marijuana at least once. By 1999, when we cut off the interdiction, it had grown to 47 percent.

In 1991, 1.7 percent of students said they used cocaine. By 1999, 8 years

later—no interdiction—4 percent said they used cocaine. It doubled.

What we have essentially seen is that, while we have increased the prevention, while we have increased the treatment, and lowered interdiction, more and more kids have taken up using drugs.

I have to tell you, the greatest prevention program in the world and the greatest treatment program in the world is to keep the student—the child—from using them in the first place.

Point No. 2, our borders and our work with international partners, whether it is Colombia or Bolivia, or Peru, or Panama—you name it—is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. No other entity can practice the interdiction. Georgia cannot do it. California cannot do it. Minnesota cannot do it. Only the U.S. Federal Government can exercise the muscle to protect our borders and to work with our alliances.

Prevention and treatment require Federal support, which has been growing rapidly, with State support and community support. It is a multifaceted effort and should be there. But only the Federal Government can do what this underlying bill suggests has to be done.

Point No. 3, the battle in Colombia is not an ideological battle. It started out that way, but it isn't anymore. This is a battle against a narcotics insurgency. They have 3 percent support in the entire country. In that country, 33,000 people have been killed fighting this. And 800,000 Colombians are displaced, as in Kosovo, and we are going to turn our back?

Colombia sits in the center of the Andean region and has already pushed its trouble into Panama, into Ecuador, and into Peru. The entire region is being affected by this struggle to maintain a democratic government in Colombia. War is a very ugly thing. It is particularly ugly when it is driven by narcotics and narcotics money, by people who care for no life, none of these 9- to 12-year-olds, no person, not even their own citizens who would be laced with armaments and blown up.

Will this be a perfect exercise? No. It isn't a perfect world. And this is a very imperfect circumstance.

We have told the people of Colombia—the President of the United States; his representatives, from Ambassador Pickering to General McCaffrey—that we understand the scope of this problem, both its relationship to Colombia, the United States, and the entire hemisphere, and that we are going to help, and that we are going to join the Europeans, and we are going to join the Colombians in the struggle; that we are going to train; that we are going to work on human rights; that we are going to work on social institutions and the fundamentals of law and the judiciary.

Legislation to do that was introduced last October. The President and the White House endorsed their version of it—it is very similar—in February. Here we are in nearly July and we are tied up in knots. You can only say, "The cavalry is coming" for so long.

The funds for drug treatment and prevention that the Senator from Minnesota seeks have been growing and growing rapidly. The interdiction has been collapsing. When it collapses, more drugs are available. The number of kids using drugs has almost doubled—9-year-olds, 10- and 11- and 12-year-olds.

The Federal responsibility is to not allow that into our country, and no State can do that. This amendment undermines the sole purpose the Federal Government has on this issue. This amount of money can be sought in 50 different States in 1,000 different communities, which they ought to contribute.

Interdiction has collapsed; utilization by our children has doubled. It is a Federal responsibility to address this problem. We better get on with it. Colombia is the heart of it. If we lose there, we lose everywhere. You can't win a war by just treating the wound.

I retain the balance of my time for the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If neither side yields time, the time will be run off equally from both sides.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Would the time be equally divided in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time will be equally charged if neither side yields time. However, if the Senator suggests the absence of a quorum, it will come off of his time, unless there is a unanimous consent request otherwise.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will now run equally.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this year's foreign operations bill provides \$934 million in emergency supplemental funding toward the administration's request for plan Colombia.

I again want to express my appreciation to Senator McCONNELL, and other members of the Appropriations Committee, for supporting provisions in the bill that will help protect human rights and strengthen the rule of law in Colombia.

I have repeatedly expressed concerns about the administration's proposal, particularly the dramatic increase in military assistance. I am troubled about what we may be getting into. The administration has yet to give me sufficient details about what it expects to achieve, in what period of time, what the long-term costs are, or what the risks are.

What the administration has said is that in addition to reducing the amount of drugs supplied from abroad, Plan Colombia is intended to prevent increases in drug addiction, violence, and crime here at home.

Those are goals that I strongly support, and I commend Senator WELLSTONE for his amendment. It would provide \$225 million for substance abuse prevention and treatment programs in the United States.

According to the Office of National Drug Control Policy, drug abuse kills 52,000 Americans each year. It costs our society nearly \$110 billion annually. It has strained the capacity of our criminal justice system and our medical facilities, and brought violence and tragedy to families, schools, and communities throughout this country.

As of 1996, there were more than 13.6 million illicit drug users in the United States. Some 50 percent of adults in immediate need of drug treatment are not receiving it, and many treatment programs have lines out the door.

Eighty percent of adolescents who need treatment—those who will, if not provided treatment, sustain the demand for drugs in the future—cannot get it.

We should help Colombia. I support President Pastrana's efforts to combat the violence, corruption, and poverty which plagues his country. But I am not convinced that the administration's request for Plan Colombia will effectively address those problems, nor is it likely to reduce the flow of drugs into our country or ameliorate the drug problem here at home.

We do know, however, that substance abuse treatment and prevention programs work. A frequently cited Rand study showed that, dollar for dollar, providing treatment to cocaine users is 10 times more effective than drug interdiction efforts, and 23 times more cost effective than eradicating coca at its source. Scientific advances promise to make future treatment and prevention programs even better.

Ultimately, reducing the demand for drugs—which is what these programs do—is the only long-term solution to reducing the flow of illegal drugs from Colombia and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I commend Senator WELLSTONE for his leadership on this issue and I urge other Senators to support his amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to address the situation in Colombia and the question of the U.S. role there.

The situation in Colombia has been correctly described as grave. To the extent that "grave" can be considered an understatement, however, that is the case with respect to the ongoing conflict in that strife-torn country. The issue ostensibly before us involves the war on drugs. What is being contemplated, however, should under no

conditions be considered a simple extension of that struggle. What is being considered is nothing less than an escalated U.S. role in what has increasingly become an all-out civil war. The relationship between the narcotics trafficking that we seek to curtail and the insurgency that we oppose but dare not engage has become dangerously blurred. To contemplate engaging one but not the other is to labor under an illusion of alarming dimensions.

Mr. President, the conditions on the ground in Colombia are not in doubt. A large, highly motivated, well-armed and funded guerrilla army, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, and the smaller but equally lethal National Liberation Front, have emerged over the last two years as a serious threat not just to Colombia, but to the entire Andean region. The FARC, in particular, has evolved into a large-scale threat to regional stability. Look carefully at the operations the FARC has carried out over the past two years. What you will see is impressive and alarming. Sophisticated battalion-size operations against Colombian military and police units, including coordinated multi-objective operations spread out across Colombia have become the norm. The March 1998 battle at El Billar, for example, demonstrated the FARC's ability to conduct battalion-size operations employing refined tactics like maneuver warfare against Colombia's best trained units. In a separate operation, a 1,200-strong guerrilla force successfully carried out simultaneous attacks on an anti-narcotics police installation and the army base at Miraflores, overwhelming both.

This should give us pause. The Colombian government's position is precarious. Already, the fighting has touched Colombia's neighbors. Panama, which lacks a military as a result of the post-invasion structure the United States imposed on that country, is now threatened by cross-border incursions by guerrillas, whose main arms pipeline crosses its border with Colombia. Colombia's other neighbors in Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela are all feeling the heat from the war in Colombia, the latter in the form of refugees escaping the fighting.

I point all of this out, Mr. President, because no one here should be under any doubt that the path down which we are heading is potentially fraught with peril. I don't know anyone who actually believes that Plan Colombia is the answer to that country's problems; we support it because we are at a loss for viable alternatives. But a guerrilla army as capable as the FARC will not be defeated by three specially-trained and equipped battalions. Much more is needed, including fundamental reform and restructuring of the Colombian armed forces to reverse the ratio of combat units to rear-area units—a key reason an army of 140,000 is stretched

so thin against guerrilla armies numbering around 20,000.

And the army and police must be thoroughly inculcated with the need to respect human rights. This not just a moral imperative, but a practical one as well. Human rights abuses by government forces increases sympathy for guerrilla armies that otherwise lack serious popular support. It is never easy, as we learned in Vietnam, to fight a guerrilla army that can melt into civilian surroundings and build an infrastructure of support, through force and intimidation if necessary, that government forces are hard-pressed to defeat without inflicting civilian casualties. But Colombia's army and police must not underestimate the importance of maintaining constant vigilance in respecting the rights of the people they purport to defend.

The United States role in Plan Colombia is, to date, limited to training the aforementioned special battalions and equipping them with modern helicopters. Toward this end, we are sending special forces teams into the field in the midst of that civil war. The primary role of U.S. Army Special Forces is the provision of such training. But we must be assured that their role will not extend to that of active combatants. The bond that will surely develop between our soldiers and those they are training must not extend to a gradual expansion of their role in Colombia.

And with respect to the issue of helicopters, Mr. President, I find it deplorable that the question of which helicopter should be provided to Colombia should be decided on the basis of any consideration other than operational requirements. Blackhawks were selected for the capabilities they provide, capabilities that are not inconsequential in terms of the Counter-Narcotics Battalions' ability to deploy to the field with the speed and in the number required to confront opposing forces. Their substitution by the Appropriations Committee with Super Hueys goes beyond the usual fiscally irresponsible approach to legislating that permeates Congress. It is, in fact, morally wrong. We are talking life and death decisions here: the ability of soldiers to fight a war. That decisions on their equipment should be decided on the basis of parochial considerations is reprehensible.

Let me return, though, to the fundamental issue of a counter narcotics strategy that is imbued with an inherent flaw: the misguided notion that the war on drugs in Colombia can be separated from the guerrilla and paramilitary activity that is the threat to Colombia's existence. If, as has been suggested, the FARC is reconsidering its involvement in the drug trade, it is possible that surgical counterdrug operations can be conducted without expanding into counterinsurgency. That the guerrillas control the very terri-

tory where the coca fields are located, however, should continue to cause us concern. To quote one unnamed U.S. official in the Christian Science Monitor, "If the guerrillas [so] choose, they don't have to continue to protect the narcos, [but] if they do... this [aid] will be used against them."

This, Mr. President, is precisely the problem. Plan Colombia is perhaps a last desperate hope to save a nation. But it carries with it the seeds of greater U.S. involvement in a civil war of enormous proportions. Those of us who have been witness to our country being gradually mired in a conflict in another region, in another time, should not fail to bear witness to the choices we make today. Funding for this plan will go forward, but the Administration and the government in Bogota should not be surprised that many of us will be watching the situation there very carefully. To do less would be to acquiesce in the possible materialization of that most feared foreign policy scenario, another Vietnam.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I reluctantly oppose the Wellstone amendment to transfer \$225 million from the military purposes of Plan Colombia to domestic substance abuse programs. The passage of this amendment would endanger the success of the Administration's plan to attempt to prevent the democratic government of Colombia from being destroyed by narco-traffickers. While I strongly support the goal of allocating additional funding to substance abuse prevention and treatment programs, this cannot be achieved at the expense of the effectiveness of Plan Colombia.

In solving the difficult problem of drug abuse and its many negative effects, the United States must seek a balanced approach. This approach must include funding for not only drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, but also for international eradication/interdiction and local law enforcement. Plan Colombia, which stresses eradication and interdiction of narcotics at their source, is a useful part of our nation's overall strategy to end drug abuse.

Colombia now supplies approximately 80 percent of the cocaine and heroin consumed in the United States. The Plan Colombia aid package, which has been designed by the Administration and the Colombian government, is a comprehensive attempt to stem this flow of narcotics. The package includes important funding for counter-narcotics support, economic development, and human rights programs.

A particularly important goal of this initiative is the promotion and protection of human rights in the Andean Region. In this respect, the Senate Foreign Operations Appropriations bill makes important contributions. The bill provides approximately \$138 million in funding for efforts to protect

human rights, strengthen the judicial system in Colombia, and support peace initiatives. In addition, all assistance to Colombian armed forces is contingent on a screening of security forces to ensure that they have not been implicated in human rights violations.

Drug abuse has taken a terrible toll on our country. It has led to increased levels of crime, a clogged judicial system, and most dramatically, the ruined lives of our nation's citizens and their families. It is for this reason that I am committed to effective drug abuse and treatment. I have worked hard to win Senate passage of legislation which would enable qualified physicians, under strict conditions, to prescribe new anti-addiction medications aimed at suppressing heroin addiction. I have also strongly supported government funding for state and local community-based programs for drug treatment. In Fiscal Year 1999, the federal government spent approximately \$5.6 billion on domestic programs directed at the reduction of drug demand.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

While I share his conviction that we as a country must do more to reduce the demand for illegal drugs in our society, I do not believe we should undermine our assistance for Plan Colombia to pay for increased domestic drug treatment and prevention programs.

Mr. President, I recently visited Colombia to assess what our aid could accomplish. I went to see the scope of drug crop cultivation and processing, to look into the political context, the human rights situation, the goals of the Pastrana Government, and to assess the capabilities of the military and the police.

I went with an open mind, though I was concerned about the reported abuses of human rights and with the effects of Colombian cocaine and heroin on the streets of New Jersey and other states.

I left Colombia convinced that we can help Colombia and help America by cooperating in the fight against drug production, trafficking, and use.

Mr. President, aid for Plan Colombia is strongly in the U.S. interest. While there can be legitimate differences of opinion about the exact content of the aid package, such as what kind of helicopters should be provided, we must use the opportunity to cooperate with a fellow democracy to fight the scourge of drugs which harms both our people.

Colombia's political will is strong. While the political situation in Colombia is uncertain, President Pastrana and the Colombian Congress have backed away from forcing early elections and appear to be working out their differences. But the Colombian people and their elected representatives want an end to the violence. They

support peace negotiations with the FARC and ELN guerrillas.

And they know the violence will not end as long as it is fueled by drug trafficking and its dirty proceeds.

The U.S. and Colombia have a symbiosis of interest in combating drug production and trafficking. While the Colombians mainly want to end financial support for various armed groups, they are highly motivated to cooperate with our main goal—eliminating a major source of narcotics destined for the United States.

Mr. President, we absolutely need to improve protection for human rights in Colombia. The Colombian people face very real risks of murder, kidnaping, extortion, and other heinous crimes, so they always live in fear. Hundreds of thousands of people have fled the violence. The Colombian Government—including the military and the police—take human rights issues very seriously.

We need to hold them to their commitments to make further progress, as the Senate bill language Senators KENNEDY and LEAHY and I authored would do.

Mr. President, was particularly impressed that the independent Prosecutor General's Office—known as the Fiscalia—is firmly committed to prosecuting criminals, particularly human rights violators. But in meeting with Colombian human rights groups, I learned that the overwhelming majority of human rights abuses are committed by the paramilitary groups, followed by the guerrillas.

Colombia must sever any remaining ties between its military and the paramilitary groups and treat them like the drug-running outlays they are. On the whole, winning the war on drugs in Colombia should do more to improve security and safeguard human rights than anything else we or the Colombian government can do.

To return to the amendment now before us, Mr. President, I believe we need to keep working to reduce demand for drugs here in America, but not at the expense of cutting efforts to eliminate a major source of drugs to our country.

We have a tremendous opportunity—if we are willing to devote a reasonable level of funding—to drastically curtail the production of cocaine and heroin in Colombia, while supporting democracy and the rule of law in that country. And, since Colombia is the source of most of the heroin and 80 percent of the cocaine sold in the United States, this is a real opportunity to help address the drug problem in our own country.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that America must do more to reduce the demand for drugs, particularly by helping those already addicted. But we should not take away from our support of Colombia's efforts in the process.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that the amendment I have introduced with Senator BOXER takes nothing away from interdiction. It does not take away from this package. We are focused on the support for the military in the southern part of Colombia. That is what this is about. This is an amendment that would transfer \$225 million from aid to the Colombian military for the push into southern Colombia into domestic drug treatment programs. It is that simple. It is not about not providing assistance to Colombia. It is not about not focusing on interdiction.

A number of different questions have been raised. To respond to some of what has been said, I will respond to the comments of my friend from Delaware.

It is important to note that right now in our country, according to ONDCP—General McCaffrey and others have talked about this quite a bit—there are about 5 million people in need of treatment and only about 2 million receive it, private or public. That means about 3 million people, more than half of the people who need treatment, don't get any at all. Why aren't we dealing with the demand side?

We have a bill out here, almost a billion dollars, and the majority leader comes to the floor and says this is all about the war on drugs. I am saying, how about a little bit that focuses on the demand side in our country. Let us have some funding for drug treatment programs for people in the United States. Yes, we have some money in the budget, but it is vastly underfunded.

The 2000 budget for SAMHSA altogether is \$1.6 billion. This is the block grant money that goes to drug treatment. The States, which are down in the trenches using a different methodology, report that close to 19 million people in our country are going without any treatment. The ONDCP estimates, moreover, that 80 percent of the adolescents in our country who are struggling with this problem are getting no treatment at all. For women who are struggling with substance abuse problems, 60 percent of them get no treatment at all. In some regions of the country, the waiting list for treatment is 6 months long or longer. The overall cost to our country for illicit drug use is about \$110 billion a year, according to the ONDCP. Right now we are spending \$1.6 billion on a block grant program that gets money down to the communities for treatment.

If anybody thinks this is just an inner-city problem, consider a COSA report entitled "No Place to Hide," which showed that drug use, drinking and smoking among young teens, is higher in rural America than our Nation's urban centers. According to this report, eighth graders, 13-year-old children in rural America, are 50 percent

more likely to use cocaine than those in urban areas—I remember when I heard Joe Califano say this; I was stunned—and 104 percent more likely to use amphetamines, including methamphetamine. Drug treatment is needed to treat addiction and to end the demand for drugs. This is not just an urban problem.

We are talking about taking \$225 million out of this almost-billion-dollar package for Colombia. We are saying, cannot any of this be put into treatment, if this is going to be called the war on drugs legislation, as the majority leader identified it. I think we have had a different debate on the floor. What I am saying as a Senator from Minnesota is, can't we take some portion of that and deal with the demand side? Can't we put some money into the war on drugs in our own country? If 80 percent of the adolescents aren't receiving any treatment and need some help, can't we get some help to them?

This amendment is supported by Legal Action Center, National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, Partnership for Recovery, and State Association of Addiction Services.

Again, I say to my colleagues, this amendment, when all is said and done, is basically saying to Senators that we can provide assistance to Colombia, and we should.

We should provide extensive assistance, including interdiction, but at the same time we ought to avoid entanglement in a decades-old civil conflict and we ought to avoid partnership with an army implicated in severe human rights abuses. Moreover, I am saying we can take at least a small portion of the resources and put it where it will do the most good, and that is in providing funding for drug treatment programs at home.

I just want to echo the words of my colleague from California. It is quite incredible to me that we can find the money for the war on drugs—close to a billion dollars—for Colombia, but we can't take \$225 million and put it into community-based treatment programs in the war on drugs in our own country.

Moreover, we have in this legislation—and I think in particular this may interest the Chair—a shift via a 7-to-1 ratio from money for police to military. This is particularly worrisome because, right now, one human rights organization after another—and we have our own State Department report on violations of human rights abuses by paramilitary groups. It points out that we have a country where civilians make up 70 percent of the casualties in that horrible war, and paramilitary groups linked to the army commit over 75 percent of the abuses.

I say to my colleagues, again, President Pastrana has made the political

decision that he wants to conduct a military campaign in the southern part of the state. All of a sudden, this debate has shifted because Senators have come out here and have said: Yes, Senator WELLSTONE, we are taking sides and we should take sides. If President Pastrana says he needs money from us to support his military in this counterinsurgency effort in the southern part of Colombia with U.S. supporters on the ground with them, and if we don't stop this in Colombia, then, God forbid, for the whole future of South or Central America—I have heard this before—at least let's have this debate out in the open.

I know this is a debate about a war on drugs, in which case I would say, yes, yes, yes. I would say, we have in this package support for the Colombian Government, but if we are going to have a war on drugs, do it in our country and deal with the demand side and put more into community treatment programs. I think we win that argument. I am sure the vast majority of people in Minnesota agree. If you are going to spend money on the war on drugs, put some money into our own country. We have a package out here that basically says, for the first time, we are going to be directly aligned with the military campaign in Colombia, in the southern part of Colombia.

I have some very real doubts that militarizing this conflict is going to somehow be a successful war against drugs. Moreover, as I have said earlier, I have some very real doubts, which are expressed by human rights organizations and religious organizations and a whole lot of people in our country and in Colombia, that we should be taking sides and we should be supporting a military which, as recently as this year, has been unwilling to change its practice and stands accused by all of the reputable human rights organizations of human rights violations.

Do we want to align ourselves with this military, with these paramilitary groups that have committed such terrorism against civilians and are responsible for most of the violence in that country? I have not a shred of sympathy or support for the guerrillas, the left-wing, the right-wing, any of them.

The question is, If it is a war against drugs, don't we want to put some money into the war against drugs here? Other than that, do we want to take sides in this military conflict? That is what my colleagues have been talking about today, and they say we have to. They say that if we do, we will be able to—we have language in this legislation that will safeguard against human rights violations by the military, that we will be able to invest this money in the military operation in southern Colombia and make sure everything will be above board. Frankly, I think that is problematic at best.

I am not sure people in Colombia or in the United States have the faintest idea what we are about to do. We haven't been able to stop any of these human rights abuses over the years. But now, all of a sudden, we are going to be right in the middle of this and take sides, and we are going to be aligned with this military campaign in southern Colombia, and we say we are going to vet it and make sure there aren't any human rights violations.

Never mind that all the human rights organizations on the ground say that will not work and the religious community says it is a profound mistake; that all sorts of government organizations in Colombia with a tremendous amount of credibility say, don't do this; don't align yourselves with this military campaign in southern Colombia. We are being told, no problem; we can vet this now.

I also want to say to my colleagues I don't think we have taken these human rights abuses, either directly by the military or the military assigned with these paramilitary groups, very seriously. Again, that is a declaration from social and human rights nongovernment organizations in Colombia; there must be 45, 50 organizations, or more. We just disregard them. They are saying, yes, interdiction, give us the package. But they are saying don't align yourselves with this military, with such a horrendous, horrific record of violence, murder, violation of human rights—alignment with the worst of the atrocities that have been committed Colombia—just as we don't want to side with the left-wing guerrillas.

Why are we now taking sides?

Again, some of my colleagues come out here and say this amendment is basically taking away assistance to Colombia. It is not. Senator BOXER did a great job on that point. We can take a couple hundred million dollars and put it into the war on drugs in our own country. We deal with the demand side. It is so naive to believe that all of what we see in our inner cities and our rural areas and suburbs, all of the addiction, all of the substance abuse which destroys people's lives—it is so naive to believe that if we now put money into a military campaign in southern Colombia, this is the way to fight a successful war on drugs. We have been down this road forever and ever and ever and ever. When are we going to get serious about dealing with the demand for drugs in our own country and the treatment programs? I don't know.

My colleagues just sort of give the human rights question the back of the hand in this debate. I have here the annual Human Rights Watch Report World 2000—I will read it again—talking about the paramilitary killers and how stark they are in their savagery, and all the ways in which the military has turned a blind eye to it, and sometimes it is connected to these groups.

And now we want to put several hundred million dollars into supporting this military directly in a campaign in southern Colombia with some of our people on the ground with them?

I have to be concerned about the path we are taking. I am not going to bore my colleagues with the statistics.

Let me ask the Chair how much time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this amendment is a sensible approach which permits extensive assistance to Colombia while safeguarding U.S. interests and avoiding entanglement in a decades-old civil conflict and partnership with an army implicated in serious human rights abuses. Moreover, it moves resources to where they will do the most good; that is, providing funding for drug treatment programs at home.

In my State of Minnesota, according to the Department of Human Services, there are 21,277 people who have requested treatment for substance abuse and have not been able to receive it. An additional 4,000 received some treatment but then were denied further treatment because resources weren't available. Most cited lack of funds to pay for the treatment, or they were put on a long waiting list when they needed the treatment the most. Others said treatment services were not appropriate for their needs—women with children, people with transportation problems, people who were trying to find jobs and needed treatment. This amendment calls for some balance.

When we started this debate several hours ago, the majority leader came out on the floor and in a very heartfelt way said this is about the war on drugs; this is about what is going on in Colombia and the ways in which that country is exporting their drugs to this country; they are killing our children.

If it is about the war on drugs, then let's make it balanced. Let's support efforts to have a war on drugs in Colombia. But let's also support the war on drugs in our own country. Some of this money ought to be put in treatment programs.

It is absolutely naive to believe we are going to be able to deal with the substance abuse problem in our country without dealing with the demand side. It is shameful that we have so little for the prevention and the treatment programs. This amendment takes just a little over \$200 million and puts it into community-based treatment programs.

I doubt whether there is a Senator, Democrat or Republican, who either does not know a friend or even a family member who struggles with alcoholism or drug abuse. We ought to be doing a much better job of getting the treatment to people. This war on drugs is fo-

cused on interdiction. It is focused on a military solution in Colombia. I argue that it is one-sided. I would argue it is naive.

Second, I have today read from about five different human rights organizations' studies, human rights organizations that I believe command tremendous respect, I hope, from all of us. I read excerpts from the State Department report of this past year. I read a letter signed by 70 nongovernment organization, human rights organizations, and people who were down in the trenches in Colombia. They all said it would be a tragic mistake for our Government to now move away from supporting police, supporting interdiction, supporting a lot of efforts in Colombia, and shift a considerable amount of money to a direct military campaign in southern Colombia—a military aligned with paramilitary groups and organizations that have committed most of the violence in the country, a military with a deplorable human rights record. It would be a tragic mistake for us now to become directly involved in this civil war. It would be a tragic mistake for our Government to support this military with Americans on the ground with them in southern Colombia. What are we getting into?

I conclude this way: I do not agree with some of my colleagues who have said that if we don't do this, it is the end for Colombia, and watch out for all of South America and Central America. I have heard that kind of argument before. It is eerie to me. It has an eerie sound to me.

I do not agree that we should take sides in this military conflict. Instead, I think we should be providing all of the support we can to President Pastrana in his good-faith effort to deal with drugs in this country, to build democratic institutions, and to have economic development. I do not believe we should turn a blind eye away from the blatant human rights violations of the military. I think it is extremely one-sided to "fight a war on drugs" which won't work, which will militarize our foreign assistance to Colombia, which will have our country directly involved in this military conflict, away from at least providing a small amount of money for community-based treatment programs.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, Senator McCONNELL is controlling time, but he is not here. Could I ask how much time is under Senator McCONNELL's control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator McCONNELL has 5 minutes remaining, and Senator WELLSTONE has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I request 3 minutes of the remaining time of the opponents of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

I strongly support the approval of this assistance for Colombia.

For the past 8 months I have chaired, together with General Brent Scowcroft, a Council on Foreign Relations Task Force on Colombia. This bipartisan Task Force released an Interim Report in March of this year which recommended that Congress approve the administration's aid request for Colombia, with two modifications. The first, that additional support should be provided to Bolivia, Peru, and other countries in the region, has been incorporated into the bill by the Appropriations Committee. The second modification, that additional trade benefits should be part of the package, I will address with the introduction of separate legislation later this week.

Let me explain why I, and the Task Force, feel so strongly that this assistance package for Colombia needs to be approved.

There is a crisis in Colombia that demands our immediate attention. While Colombia has experienced violence and guerrilla insurgencies for many years, the current crisis is unique in several important ways. First, Colombia is experiencing record violence which is killing over 25,000 Colombians each year. More than half of all kidnappings in the world occur in Colombia. The FARC and ELN guerrilla forces and the paramilitary groups are escalating their violence in ways that have not been seen before.

Second, our success in reducing coca cultivation in Peru and Bolivia has shifted the production and cultivation of coca to Colombia, with an explosion of coca cultivation in southern Colombia in the past five years. Over 90 percent of the cocaine on our streets comes from Colombia. More importantly, the guerrilla forces operating in Colombia have become directly involved in narco-trafficking. Where they once provided protection for drug traffickers, they now are directly involved in the production and transport of illegal drugs. This provides them with an almost limitless source of revenue. For the first time we have a guerrilla organization that does not rely on external sources of funding.

Third, the Colombian economy is experiencing its worst recession since the 1930s. An unemployment rate of over 20 percent is exacerbating social and political tensions. The violence is deterring investment making economic recovery more difficult.

Fourth, Colombians are leaving Colombia at record rates. Last year over 100,000 Colombians moved to my State of Florida alone. Hundreds of thousands more have come to other parts of



the United States to escape the violence and instability.

It is this combination of factors that led President Pastrana, working closely with our administration, to propose Plan Colombia. To many, Plan Colombia is only about drugs, but in reality it is a broad plan that addresses five key areas: the peace process; the Colombian economy; the counter-drug strategy; justice reform and human rights; and democratization and social development. It is this broad based plan to rebuild the Colombian state that needs our support.

Some have said that Plan Colombia is only about providing military equipment to Colombia. Indeed, Plan Colombia is much more comprehensive and far-reaching. But, the United States contribution to Plan Colombia is heavily weighted toward military equipment. There is a good reason for this. Plan Colombia is a \$7.5 billion plan, of which the Colombians themselves will provide over \$4 billion. They are looking to the United States to provide about \$1.6 billion and to international community for the remainder.

It is appropriate that the portion of the funding being provided by the United States focus on the counter-drug part of Plan Colombia since this is of particular interest to us and since we are the only country that can supply that type of support. It is also the part of Plan Colombia that is most compelling for U.S. involvement, since it involves keeping drugs off of our streets.

Some have argued that there are risks associated with providing this type of support to Colombia. That is true, but there are also risks associated with doing nothing, and I believe that the risks associated with doing nothing are far greater than the risks involved with helping the Colombian Government and the Colombian people.

We have important national interests at stake in Colombia that would be critically harmed were the current situation in Colombia to continue. First, Colombia is the oldest democracy in South America and has been an important partner in bringing democracy and democratic values to all of our hemispheric neighbors, with the exception of Cuba. We must act to preserve democracy.

Second, the entire Andean region is threatened by instability and Colombia is the center of that instability. Failure to stem the crisis in Colombia could lead to increased instability in Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Panama, and Venezuela. A stronger Colombia means a stronger region and a stronger Western Hemisphere.

Third, a complete breakdown in Colombia would make it even more difficult to control the drug trafficking. And the illegal networks that are set up by drug traffickers also involve other illegal activities that threaten

our security, such as money laundering and financial crimes, arms trafficking, human smuggling, cargo theft, and terrorism.

Fourth, Colombia is an important trading partner for the United States. It is South America's fourth largest economy and the fifth largest export market in Latin America for the United States. Colombia has the potential to be an economic engine for the Andean region and an even bigger market for U.S. goods. The violence and instability in Colombia are preventing economic growth, including the exploitation of large, newly discovered oil fields that would help to reduce gasoline prices in the United States.

Fifth, the exodus of Colombians, nearly 1 million in the past 5 years, further exacerbates our own immigration problems. A further downturn in the Colombian situation could lead to an immigration crisis that would directly impact the United States.

Finally, for those concerned about human rights, and I consider myself in that category, the deteriorating human rights situation in Colombia can only be reversed through the implementation of Plan Colombia, with the government gaining effective control over its national territory. President Pastrana has demonstrated his will to improve the human rights situation in Colombia, and has taken concrete steps, including dismissing senior military officers, to demonstrate his determination.

With all of this at stake it is hard to understand why we have not been able to move faster to approve this assistance package. And there are direct costs associated with this delay. Last December I visited the first of the Colombian counternarcotics battalions that are to be trained and equipped by the U.S. as part of Plan Colombia. The U.S. Special Forces soldiers who were training them reported that their moral was excellent and they were as capable at their tasks as any soldiers they have ever trained.

Unfortunately, this battalion has been doing very little other than calisthenics since my visit, largely because of our failure to move this assistance package. They are limited to where they can reach by foot, since they have no mobility capability. They have no fuel for the helicopters they were given on an interim basis by the State Department. The valuable training they received is wasting away, and their skills are fading from lack of practice.

In addition, the second Colombian counternarcotics battalion has been vetted but are unable to begin training. Eradication of coca and opium poppy has been halted. Crop substitution and alternative development programs are also on hold, as are the human rights and judicial reform programs that are included in the legislation. Meanwhile, the guerrillas and the drug traffickers

continue to strengthen and expand their operations. The peace process has floundered and the violence has escalated. Each day we wait the situation worsens, the regional instability increases, the drugs flow out of Colombia, and the money and effort required to turn the situation around increases.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to act now and support this vital package of assistance for Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCONNELL. I reserve the remainder of my time.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY A DELEGATION FROM THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to welcome a delegation from the European Parliament to the U.S. Senate. The parliamentarians are in the United States for an important interparliamentary meeting.

Europe continues to move forward with economic integration and the European Parliament's role is increasingly important. As the European Union, like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization expands, the role of the European Parliament will become even more important.

The United States and the European Union have the world's largest commercial relationship, with trade and investment approaching \$1 trillion.

I believe increased interaction between our legislature and the European Parliament will serve the interests of both sides.

I urge my colleagues to greet this delegation, led by Ms. Imelda Mary Read of the United Kingdom.

I take note that the delegation has more women than men and one of the youngest Members attending the interparliamentary meeting is from the European Parliament. Obviously, great progress is being made in this parliamentary body.

I ask unanimous consent the list of all the delegation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT—DELEGATION FOR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Ms Imelda Mary Read, Chair, United Kingdom.

Mr Bastian Belder, 1st Vice-Chairman, Netherlands.

Mr James E.M. Elles, United Kingdom.

Mr Bertel Haarder, Denmark.

Ms Magdalene Hoff, Germany.

Ms Piia-Noora Kauppi, Finland.

Ms Erika Mann, Germany.

Ms Arlene McCarthy, United Kingdom.

Ms Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Germany.

Mr Peter William Skinner, United Kingdom.

Mr Dirk Sterckx, Belgium.